arXiv:1609.08494v1 [math.CO] 27 Sep 2016

ON INVOLUTIONS IN WEYL GROUPS

JING ZHANG AND JUN HU

ABSTRACT. Let (W, S) be a Coxeter system and $*$ be an automorphism of W with order ≤ 2 such that $s^* \in S$ for any $s \in S$. Let I_* be the set of twisted involutions in W. We study the reduced I_*-expressions of twisted involutions and the braid I_*-transformations between them. We show that any usual braid transformation naturally induces a braid I_*-transformation. If W is the Weyl group of type B_n or D_n and $* = \mathrm{id}$, we explicitly determine a *finite* many types of basic braid I_*-transformations, and show that any two reduced I_*-expressions for a given involution can be transformed into each other through a series of basic braid I_*-transformations. In both cases, these basic braid I_*-transformations consist of the ones induced from the usual basic braid transformations and exactly one extra special braid I_*-transformation. The main result generalizes our previous work for the Weyl group of type A_{n-1}.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let (W, S) be a fixed Coxeter system with length function $\ell : W \to \mathbb{N}$. If $w \in W$ then by definition

$$\ell(w) := \min\{k | w = s_{i_1} \dots s_{i_k} \text{ for some } s_{i_1}, \dots, s_{i_k} \in S\}.$$

Let "$\leq$" be the Bruhat partial ordering on W which was defined with respect to S. Let "$*$" be a fixed automorphism of W with order ≤ 2 and such that $s^* \in S$ for any $s \in S$.

1.1. **Definition.** We define $I_* := \left\{w \in W \;\middle|\; w^* = w^{-1}\right\}$. The elements of I_* will be called twisted involutions.

If $* = \mathrm{id}_W$ (the identity automorphism on W), then the elements of I_* will be called involutions.

1.2. **Definition.** For any $w \in I_*$ and $s \in S$, we define

$$s \ltimes w := \begin{cases} sw & \text{if } sw = ws^*; \\ sws^* & \text{if } sw \neq ws^*. \end{cases}$$

For any $w \in I_*$ and $s_{i_1}, \cdots, s_{i_k} \in S$, we define

$$s_{i_1} \ltimes s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k} \ltimes w := s_{i_1} \ltimes \left(s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes \left(s_{i_k} \ltimes w\right) \cdots\right).$$

It is clear that $s \ltimes w \in I_*$ whenever $w \in I_*$ and $s \in S$.

1.3. **Definition.** ([**5, 6**]) Let $w \in I_*$. If $w = s_{i_1} \ltimes s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k}$, where $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $s_{i_j} \in S$ for each j, then $(s_{i_1}, \cdots, s_{i_k})$ is called an I_*-expression for w. Such an I_*-expression for w is reduced if its length k is minimal.

We regard the empty sequence $()$ as a reduced I_*-expression for $w = 1$. It follows by induction on $\ell(w)$ that every element $w \in I_*$ has a reduced I_*-expression.

A well-known classical fact of Matsumoto ([**14**]) says that any two reduced expressions for an element in W can be transformed into each other through a series of basic braid transformations. We are interested in finding a right analogue of this fact for twisted involution with respect to the operation "$\ltimes$". In Proposition 2.10 we show that any usual

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20C08.

Key words and phrases. Weyl groups, Hecke algebras, twisted involutions.

(basic) braid transformation naturally induces a (basic) braid I_*-transformation. If W is the Weyl group of type B_n or type D_n and $* = \mathrm{id}$, we determine all the basic braid I_*-transformations, and show that any two reduced I_*-expressions for a given involution can be transformed into each other through a series of basic braid I_*-transformations. These results generalize our earlier work in [**8**] for the Weyl group of type A_{n-1}. Note that these generalizations are non-trivial in the sense that the (basic) braid I_*-transformations for the Weyl group of type B_n and D_n which we found contain extra special braid I_*-transformations which do not come from the usual (basic) braid transformations, see the last relation in Definition 3.14 and 4.9. This is a new phenomenon which does not happen in type A case, compare [**8**, Definition 2.12].

The motivation for the study of reduced I_*-expressions for involution comes from a conjecture of Lusztig. Let v be an indeterminate over $\mathbb{Z}$ and $u := v^2$. Set $A := \mathbb{Z}[u^2, u^{-2}]$, $\mathcal{A} := \mathbb{Z}[u, u^{-1}]$. Let $\mathscr{H}_{u^2}$ be the one-parameter Iwahori–Hecke algebra associated to (W, S) with Hecke parameter u^2 and defined over A (cf. [**7**]). Let $\mathcal{H}_u := \mathcal{A} \otimes_A \mathscr{H}_{u^2}$. We abbreviate $1_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes_A T_w$ as T_w for each $w \in W$. Let M be the free $\mathcal{A}$-module with basis $\{a_w | w \in I_*\}$. An $\mathcal{H}_u$-module structure on M was introduced by Lusztig and Vogan ([**13**]) in the special case where W is a Weyl group or an affine Weyl group, and by Lusztig ([**10**]) in the general case. When u is specialized to 1, the module M was introduced more than fifteen years ago by Kottwitz. Kottwitz found the module by analyzing Langlands' theory of stable characters for real groups; he gave a conjectural description of it (later established by Casselman) in terms of the Kazhdan-Lusztig left cell representations of W. For these reasons it was clear that M was an interesting, subtle, and important object. In [**11**, 3.4(a)] Lusztig defined $X_\emptyset := \sum_{x \in W, x^* = x} u^{-\ell(x)} T_x \in \mathcal{H}_u$ and he conjectured that there is a unique isomorphism of $(\mathbb{Q}(u) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}_u)$-modules $\eta : \mathbb{Q}(u) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} M \cong (\mathbb{Q}(u) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}_u) X_\emptyset$ such that $\eta(a_1) = X_\emptyset$.

In [**8**], we give a proof of this conjecture in the case when $* = \mathrm{id}_W$ and W is the Weyl group of type A_{n-1} for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The key ingredient in the proof is to prove an analogue of Matsumoto's result for reduced I_*-expressions of involutions. We have announced in that paper that the same strategy should work for the Weyl groups of other types. Later Lusztig proved his conjecture (in [**12**]) for any Coxeter group and any $*$ by using a completely different argument. Despite of this fact, it is still interesting in itself to generalize Matsumoto's result for reduced I_*-expressions of involutions to Weyl groups of arbitrary types (other than type A). In this paper we give this generalization for the Weyl groups of type B_n and type D_n by finding out a ***finite*** many types of basic braid I_*-transformations on reduced I_*-expressions for involutions.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we recall some preliminary knowledge and known results on reduced I_*-expressions for twisted involutions. We show in Proposition 2.10 that any usual (basic) braid transformation naturally induces a (basic) braid I_*-transformation on reduced I_*-expressions for twisted involutions. Based on the work of Lusztig [**10**, 1.2, 1.4], we give a case by case discussion after Lemma 2.12 in the case when $* = \mathrm{id}$ which will be used in the next two sections. In Section 3 we consider the Weyl group $W(D_n)$ of type D_n and give the definition of basic braid I_*-transformation on reduced I_*-expressions for involutions in $W(D_n)$ in Definition 3.14. In Section 4 we consider the Weyl group $W(B_n)$ of type B_n and give the definition of basic braid I_*-transformation on reduced I_*-expressions for involutions in $W(B_n)$ in Definition 4.9. The main result is Theorem 3.17 and 4.11, where we show that any two reduced I_*-expressions for an involution in $W \in \{W(D_n), W(B_n)\}$ can be transformed into each other through a series of braid I_*-transformations. In Section 5 we use the main result in Section 3 and Section 4 to show that η is a well-defined surjective $(\mathbb{Q}(u) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}_u)$-module homomorphism when W is the Weyl group of type B_n or D_n and $* = \mathrm{id}$.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Both authors were supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC 11525102). The second author was also supported by the research fund from Zhejiang University.

2. REDUCED I_*-EXPRESSIONS

Let (W, S) be a fixed Coxeter system with length function $\ell : W \to \mathbb{N}$. For any $s \neq t \in S$, let $m_{s,t} = m_{t,s} \in [2, \infty]$ be the order of st.

2.1. **Lemma.** *(*[**8**, Lemma 2.2]*) For any $w \in I_*$ and $s \in S$, we have that*

$$s \ltimes (s \ltimes w) = w.$$

It is well-known that every element $w \in I_*$ is of the form $w = s_{i_1} \ltimes s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s_{i_1}, \cdots, s_{i_k} \in S$.

2.2. **Lemma.** *(*[**5**], [**6**]*) Let $w \in I_*$. Any reduced I_*-expression for w has a common length. Let $\rho : I_* \to \mathbb{N}$ be the map which assigns $w \in I_*$ to this common length. Then $(I_*, \leq)$ is a graded poset with rank function ρ. Moreover, if $s \in S$ then $\rho(s \ltimes w) = \rho(w) \pm 1$, and $\rho(s \ltimes w) = \rho(w) - 1$ if and only if $\ell(sw) = \ell(w) - 1$.*

2.3. **Corollary.** *(*[**8**, Corollary 2.6]*) Let $w \in I_*$ and $s \in S$. Suppose that $sw \neq ws^*$. Then $\ell(sw) = \ell(w)+1$ if and only if $\ell(ws^*) = \ell(w)+1$, and if and only if $\ell(s \ltimes w) = \ell(w)+2$. The same is true if we replace "$+$" by "$-$".*

2.4. **Corollary.** *(*[**8**, Corollary 2.7]*) Let $w \in I_*$ and $s \in S$. Suppose that $\rho(w) = k$. If $sw < w$ then w has a reduced I_*-expression which is of the form $s \ltimes s_{j_1} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{j_{k-1}}$.*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 2.2 and the fact (Lemma 2.1) that $w = s \ltimes (s \ltimes w)$. □

2.5. **Corollary.** *Let $s \in S$ and $w \in I_*$. Then*

$$s \ltimes w = \begin{cases} sw & \text{if } sw \in I_*; \\ sws^* & \text{if } \ell(sws^*) \neq \ell(w). \end{cases}$$

2.6. **Definition.** ([**8**, Definition 2.8]) Let $w \in I_*$ and $s_{i_1}, \cdots, s_{i_k} \in S$. If

$$\rho(s_{i_1} \ltimes s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k} \ltimes w) = \rho(w) + k,$$

then we shall call the sequence $(s_{i_1}, \cdots, s_{i_k}, w)$ reduced, or $(s_{i_1}, \cdots, s_{i_k}, w)$ a reduced sequence.

In particular, any reduced I_*-expression for $w \in I_*$ is automatically a reduced sequence. In the sequel, by some abuse of notations, we shall also call $(i_1, \cdots, i_k)$ a reduced sequence whenever $(s_{i_1}, \cdots, s_{i_k})$ is a reduced sequence in the sense of Definition 2.6.

2.7. *Remark.* Let $s_{i_1}, \cdots, s_{i_k} \in S$ and $1 \leq a \leq k$. We shall use the expression

$$s_{i_1} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_{a-1}} \ltimes s_{i_{a+1}} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k} \tag{2.8}$$

to denote the element obtained by omitting "$s_{i_a} \ltimes$" in the expression $s_{i_1} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k}$. In particular, if $a = 1$ then (2.8) denotes the element $s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k}$; while if $a = k$ then (2.8) denotes the element $s_{i_1} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_{k-1}}$.

2.9. **Proposition.** *(Exchange Property,* [**6**, Prop. 3.10]*) Suppose $(s_{i_1}, \cdots, s_{i_k})$ is a reduced I_*-expression for $w \in I_*$ and that $\rho(s \ltimes s_{i_1} \ltimes s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k}) < k$ for some $s \in S$. Then*

$$s \ltimes s_{i_1} \ltimes s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k} = s_{i_1} \ltimes s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_{a-1}} \ltimes s_{i_{a+1}} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k}$$

for some $a \in \{1, 2, \cdots, k\}$.

Let (W, S) be an arbitrary Coxeter system. For any $s, t \in S$, recall that m_{st} is the order of st. Then m_{st} is the order of ts too. Suppose that $m_{st} < \infty$. We define

$$\mathrm{Prod}(s, t; m_{st}) := \underbrace{ststst\cdots}_{m_{st} \text{ factors}}.$$

By definition, we have that $\mathrm{Prod}(s, t; m_{st}) = \mathrm{Prod}(t, s; m_{st})$. In this case, we shall call the transformation $\mathrm{Prod}(s, t; m_{st}) \longleftrightarrow \mathrm{Prod}(t, s; m_{st})$ the *(usual) basic braid transformation*. By a *(usual) braid transformation* on a given reduced expression, we mean the compositions of a series of (usual) basic braid transformations.

For any $s, t \in S$, we define

$$\mathrm{TProd}(s, t; m_{st}) := \underbrace{s \ltimes t \ltimes s \ltimes t \ltimes \cdots}_{m_{st} \text{ factors}} \ltimes.$$

Note that $\mathrm{Prod}(s, t; m_{st})$ is an element of W, while $\mathrm{TProd}(s, t; m_{st})$ is an operator on I_* instead of an element of W.

Our purpose is to find out the right analogues of (basic) braid transformations for twisted involutions in I_* and the operation "$\ltimes$". The following result amounts to saying that any usual (basic) braid transformation naturally induces a (basic) braid I_*-transformation on reduced I_*-expression.

2.10. **Proposition.** *Let $1 \neq w \in I_*$ and $s, t \in S$. Suppose that $2 \leq m_{st} < \infty$, and $(\underbrace{s, t, s, t, \ldots}_{m_{st} \text{ factors}}, w)$ is a reduced I_*-expression. Then*

$$\mathrm{TProd}(s, t; m_{st})w = \mathrm{TProd}(t, s; m_{st})w.$$

Proof. Set $m := m_{st}$. By Lemma 2.2 and the assumption that $\mathrm{TProd}(s, t; m)w$ is a reduced I_*-expression, we have that

$$\mathrm{TProd}(s, t; m)w = \mathrm{Prod}(s, t; m)w\,\mathrm{Prod}(r^*, q^*; k), \tag{2.11}$$

for some $(r, q) \in \{(s, t), (t, s)\}$ and some $k \leq m$, such that the right hand-side of (2.11) is a usual reduced expression.

We claim that $m - k \leq 2$. In fact, by definition, for any $s \in S, w \in I_*$, the result of $s \ltimes w$ has two possibilities: the first possibility is equal to sws^*, while the second possibility is equal to $sw = ws^*$. Note that s, t appears alternatively in $\mathrm{TProd}(s, t; m)$. Therefore, the reducibility of the right hand-side of (2.11) implies that for those s, t which appear in $\mathrm{TProd}(s, t; m)$, the first possibility always occurs with the only two possible exceptions: one is the leftmost simple reflection s and the other is the rightmost simple reflection (which is s if m is odd and is t otherwise). This proves that $m - k \leq 2$. As a consequence, it remains to consider the following three cases:

Case 1. $k = m$. In this case, there are no exceptions. That says, the first possibility always occurs for all the s, t appear in $\mathrm{TProd}(s, t; m)$. Note that if $s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \ldots s_{i_k}$ is a reduced expression then $s_{i_a} s_{i_{a+1}} \ldots s_{i_b}$ is a reduced expression too for any $1 \leq a < b \leq k$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{TProd}(s, t; m)w &= \mathrm{Prod}(s, t; m)w\,\mathrm{Prod}(s^*, t^*; m)^{-1} \\ &= \mathrm{Prod}(t, s; m)w\,\mathrm{Prod}(t^*, s^*; m)^{-1} = \mathrm{TProd}(t, s; m)w,\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Corollary 2.5.

Case 2. $k = m - 1$. In this case, there is only one exception. We have that either

$$\mathrm{TProd}(s, t; m)w = \mathrm{Prod}(s, t; m)w\,\mathrm{Prod}(s^*, t^*; m - 1)^{-1},$$

or $\mathrm{TProd}(s, t; m)w = \mathrm{Prod}(s, t; m)w\,\mathrm{Prod}(t^*, s^*; m - 1)^{-1}$.

In the first situation,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{TProd}(s,t;m)w &= \mathrm{Prod}(s,t;m)w\,\mathrm{Prod}(s^*,t^*;m-1)^{-1}\\ &= \mathrm{Prod}(t,s;m)w\,\mathrm{Prod}(s^*,t^*;m-1)^{-1}\\ &= t\,\mathrm{Prod}(s,t;m-1)w\,\mathrm{Prod}(s^*,t^*;m-1)^{-1}\\ &= t(\mathrm{TProd}(s,t;m-1)w)\\ &= \mathrm{TProd}(t,s;m)w\end{aligned}$$

where the last two equalities follow from Corollary 2.5; or

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{TProd}(s,t;m)w &= \mathrm{Prod}(s,t;m)w\,\mathrm{Prod}(t^*,s^*;m-1)^{-1}\\ &= \mathrm{Prod}(t,s;m)w\,\mathrm{Prod}(t^*,s^*;m-1)^{-1}\\ &= \mathrm{Prod}(t,s;m-1)aw\,\mathrm{Prod}(t^*,s^*;m-1)^{-1}\\ &= \mathrm{TProd}(s,t;m-1)(aw)\\ &= \mathrm{TProd}(t,s;m)w,\end{aligned}$$

where $a \in \{s,t\}$ and the last two equalities follow from Corollary 2.5.

Case 3. $k = m-2$. In this case, there are exactly two exceptions, i.e., the leftmost simple reflection s and the rightmost simple reflection. Applying (2.11) and Corollary 2.5, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{TProd}(s,t;m)w &= \mathrm{Prod}(s,t;m)w\,\mathrm{Prod}(r^*,q^*;m-2)\\ &= s\,\mathrm{Prod}(t,s;m-1)w\,\mathrm{Prod}(r^*,q^*;m-2)\\ &= \mathrm{Prod}(t,s;m-2)(\hat{r}w)\,\mathrm{Prod}(r^*,q^*;m-2)s^*,\end{aligned}$$

where $(r,q) \in \{(s,t),(t,s)\}$, $\hat{r} \in \{s,t\} \setminus \{r\}$ such that $\hat{r}w = w(\hat{r})^*$, and the right hand-side of the above equalities are usual reduced expressions. Furthermore, the above equality and Corollary 2.5 implies that $\mathrm{Prod}(r^*,q^*;m-2) = \mathrm{Prod}(t^*,s^*;m-2)^{-1}$. Now

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Prod}(s,t;m)w\,\mathrm{Prod}(t^*,s^*;m-2)^{-1}\\ &= \mathrm{Prod}(s,t;m-2)r\hat{r}w\,\mathrm{Prod}(t^*,s^*;m-2)^{-1}\\ &= s\,\mathrm{Prod}(t,s;m-2)\hat{r}w\,\mathrm{Prod}(t^*,s^*;m-2)^{-1}\\ &= \mathrm{Prod}(t,s;m-2)w\hat{r}^*\,\mathrm{Prod}(t^*,s^*;m-2)^{-1}s^*\\ &= \mathrm{Prod}(t,s;m-2)w\,\mathrm{Prod}(s^*,t^*;m)^{-1}\\ &= \mathrm{Prod}(t,s;m-2)w\,\mathrm{Prod}(t^*,s^*;m)^{-1}\\ &= \mathrm{Prod}(t,s;m-2)wr^*\hat{r}^*\,\mathrm{Prod}(t^*,s^*;m-2)^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Prod}(s,t;m)w\,\mathrm{Prod}(t^*,s^*;m-2)^{-1}\\ &= \mathrm{Prod}(t,s;m)w\,\mathrm{Prod}(t^*,s^*;m-2)^{-1}\\ &= \mathrm{Prod}(t,s;m-2)\hat{r}rw\,\mathrm{Prod}(t^*,s^*;m-2)^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{Prod}(t,s;m-2)wr^*\hat{r}^*\,\mathrm{Prod}(t^*,s^*;m-2)^{-1}\\ &= \mathrm{Prod}(t,s;m-2)\hat{r}rw\,\mathrm{Prod}(t^*,s^*;m-2)^{-1},\end{aligned}$$

which forces $\hat{r}rw\hat{r}^* = wr^*$ and hence $\hat{r}r\hat{r}w = wr^*$.

Suppose that $m \geq 3$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{TProd}(s,t;m)w = \mathrm{Prod}(s,t;m)w\,\mathrm{Prod}(t^*,s^*;m-2)^{-1}\\ &= \mathrm{Prod}(s,t;m-3)\hat{r}r\hat{r}w\,\mathrm{Prod}(t^*,s^*;m-2)^{-1}\\ &= \mathrm{Prod}(s,t;m-3)wr^*\,\mathrm{Prod}(t^*,s^*;m-2)^{-1},\end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\ell(\mathrm{TProd}(s,t;m)w) < \ell(w)+2m-2$, a contradiction. Therefore, we must have that $m=2$. In this case, we have that

$$\mathrm{TProd}(s,t;m)w = stw = tsw = \mathrm{TProd}(t,s;m)w,$$

where the last equality holds because

$$tsw = stw = swt^* = wt^*s^* = tws^*$$

implies that $sw = ws^*$ and $tsw = swt^*$. This completes the proof of the theorem. □

In the rest of this section, we assume that $* = \mathbf{id}$. In particular, $I_* = \{w \in W | w^2 = 1\}$ is the set of involutions in W. If $w = 1$ (the identity element of W), then for any $s \in S$, $s \ltimes w = s \ltimes 1 = s$.

2.12. **Lemma.** *Suppose that $w \in I_*$. Let $s \ltimes s_{i_1} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k}$ and $t \ltimes s_{j_1} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{j_k}$ be two reduced I_*-expressions of w such that $s \neq t$. Let $K := \{s,t\}$, W_K is the subgroup of W generated by K and $\Omega := W_K w W_K$. Suppose that $|W_K| < \infty$. Let $b \in W$ be the unique minimal length distinguished (W_K, W_K)-double coset representative in Ω. Then $b \in I_*$ and w is the unique maximal length distinguished (W_K, W_K)-double coset representative in Ω.*

Proof. By assumption, $b \in W$ is the unique minimal length distinguished (W_K, W_K)-double coset representative in Ω. It follows that $b^{-1} \in W$ is also the unique minimal length distinguished (W_K, W_K)-double coset representative in Ω. Hence $b = b^{-1}$ and $b \in I_*$. This proves the first statement of the lemma. Applying Lemma 2.2, we see that $sw < w > tw$. Then the second statement of the lemma follows from [**2**, Corollary 4.19]. □

We keep the same notations as Lemma 2.12. Let $m := m_{s,t} = m_{t,s}$ be the order of st. Following [**10**], for each $1 \leq i \leq m$, we set

$$\mathfrak{s}_i := \underbrace{sts\ldots}_{i \text{ factors}}, \quad \mathfrak{t}_i := \underbrace{tst\ldots}_{i \text{ factors}}.$$

Set $J := K \cap bKb^{-1}$. By [**10**, 1.2(a), 1.4], there are only the following seven cases.

Case 1. $\{sb, tb\} \cap \{bs, bt\} = \emptyset$, $J = \emptyset$, $\Omega \cap I_* = \{\xi_{2i}, \xi'_{2i} | 0 \leq i \leq m\}$, where $\xi_0 = \xi'_0 = b$, $\xi_{2m} = \xi'_{2m} = \tilde{b}$, $\xi_{2i} = \mathfrak{s}_i^{-1} b \mathfrak{s}_i$, $\xi'_{2i} = \mathfrak{t}_i^{-1} b \mathfrak{t}_i$, $\ell(\xi_{2i}) = \ell(\xi'_{2i}) = \ell(b) + 2i$; In this case,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{b} = w_K b w_K &= \underbrace{sts\ldots}_{m \text{ factors}} b \underbrace{sts\ldots}_{m \text{ factors}} = \underbrace{tst\ldots}_{m \text{ factors}} b \underbrace{tst\ldots}_{m \text{ factors}} \\ &= \underbrace{sts\ldots}_{m \text{ factors}} b \underbrace{tst\ldots}_{m \text{ factors}} = \underbrace{tst\ldots}_{m \text{ factors}} b \underbrace{sts\ldots}_{m \text{ factors}}.\end{aligned}$$

By length consideration we can deduce that

$$\tilde{b} = \underbrace{s \ltimes t \ltimes s \ltimes \ldots}_{m \text{ factors}} \ltimes b = \underbrace{t \ltimes s \ltimes t \ltimes \ldots}_{m \text{ factors}} \ltimes b.$$

Case 2. $sb = bs, tb \neq bt$, $J = \{s\}$, $\Omega \cap I_* = \{\xi_{2i}, \xi_{2i+1} | 0 \leq i \leq m-1\}$, where $\xi_0 = b, \xi_{2m-1} = \tilde{b}$, $\xi_{2i} = \mathfrak{t}_i^{-1} b \mathfrak{t}_i$, $\xi_{2i+1} = \mathfrak{t}_i^{-1} b \mathfrak{s}_{i+1} = \mathfrak{s}_{i+1}^{-1} b \mathfrak{t}_i$, $\ell(\xi_{2i}) = \ell(b) + 2i$, $\ell(\xi_{2i+1}) = \ell(b) + 2i + 1$; In this case,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{b} = w_K w_J b w_K &= \underbrace{sts\ldots}_{m \text{ factors}}(sb) \underbrace{sts\ldots}_{m \text{ factors}} = \underbrace{sts\ldots}_{m \text{ factors}}(bs) \underbrace{sts\ldots}_{m \text{ factors}} \\ &= \underbrace{sts\ldots}_{m \text{ factors}} b \underbrace{tst\ldots}_{m-1 \text{ factors}} = \underbrace{tst\ldots}_{m \text{ factors}} b \underbrace{tst\ldots}_{m-1 \text{ factors}}.\end{aligned}$$

By length consideration we can deduce that

$$\tilde{b} = \underbrace{s \ltimes t \ltimes s \ltimes \ldots}_{m \text{ factors}} \ltimes b = \underbrace{t \ltimes s \ltimes t \ltimes \ldots}_{m \text{ factors}} \ltimes b.$$

Case 3. $sb \neq bs, tb = bt$, $J = \{t\}$, $\Omega \cap I_* = \{\xi_{2i}, \xi_{2i+1} | 0 \leq i \leq m-1\}$, where $\xi_0 = b, \xi_{2m-1} = \tilde{b}$, $\xi_{2i} = \mathfrak{s}_i^{-1} b \mathfrak{s}_i$, $\xi_{2i+1} = \mathfrak{s}_i^{-1} b \mathfrak{t}_{i+1} = \mathfrak{t}_{i+1}^{-1} b \mathfrak{s}_i$, $\ell(\xi_{2i}) = \ell(b) + 2i$, $\ell(\xi_{2i+1}) = \ell(b) + 2i + 1$; In this case,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{b} = w_K w_J b w_K &= \underbrace{sts\dots}_{m \text{ factors}}(tb)\ \underbrace{sts\dots}_{m \text{ factors}} = \underbrace{sts\dots}_{m \text{ factors}}(bt)\ \underbrace{tst\dots}_{m \text{ factors}} \\ &= \underbrace{sts\dots}_{m \text{ factors}} b\ \ \underbrace{sts\dots}_{m-1 \text{ factors}}\ = \underbrace{tst\dots}_{m \text{ factors}} b\ \ \underbrace{sts\dots}_{m-1 \text{ factors}}\ .\end{aligned}$$

By length consideration we can deduce that

$$\tilde{b} = \underbrace{s \ltimes t \ltimes s \ltimes \dots}_{m \text{ factors}} \ltimes b = \underbrace{t \ltimes s \ltimes t \ltimes \dots}_{m \text{ factors}} \ltimes b.$$

Case 4. $sb = bs, tb = bt$, $J = K$, m is odd, $\Omega \cap I_* = \{\xi_0 = \xi_0' = b, \xi_m = \xi_m' = \tilde{b}, \xi_{2i+1}, \xi_{2i+1}' | 0 \leq i \leq (m-1)/2\}$, where $\xi_1 = sb$, $\xi_3 = tstb$, $\xi_5 = ststsb$, $\dots$; $\xi_1' = tb$, $\xi_3' = stsb$, $\xi_5' = tststb$, $\dots$; $\ell(\xi_{2i+1}) = \ell(\xi_{2i+1}') = \ell(b) + 2i + 1$; In this case,

$$\tilde{b} = w_K w_J b w_K = w_K w_J b w_K = b w_K = \underbrace{sts\dots s}_{m \text{ factors}}(b) = \underbrace{tst\dots t}_{m \text{ factors}}(b).$$

By length consideration we can deduce that

$$\tilde{b} = \underbrace{s \ltimes t \ltimes s \ltimes \dots}_{(m+1)/2 \text{ factors}} \ltimes b = \underbrace{t \ltimes s \ltimes t \ltimes \dots}_{(m+1)/2 \text{ factors}} \ltimes b.$$

Case 5. $sb = bs, tb = bt$, $J = K$, m is even, $\Omega \cap I_* = \{\xi_0 = \xi_0' = b, \xi_m = \xi_m' = \tilde{b}, \xi_{2i+1}, \xi_{2i+1}' | 0 \leq i \leq (m-2)/2\}$, where $\xi_1 = sb$, $\xi_3 = tstb$, $\xi_5 = ststsb$, $\dots$; $\xi_1' = tb$, $\xi_3' = stsb$, $\xi_5' = tststb$, $\dots$; $\ell(\xi_{2i+1}) = \ell(\xi_{2i+1}') = \ell(b) + 2i + 1$; $\xi_m = \xi_m' = b\mathfrak{s}_m = b\mathfrak{t}_m = \mathfrak{s}_m b = \mathfrak{t}_m b$; $\ell(\xi_m) = \ell(\xi_m') = \ell(b) + m$. In this case, using a similar argument as in Case 4, we can get that

$$\tilde{b} = \underbrace{s \ltimes t \ltimes s \ltimes \dots}_{m/2+1 \text{ factors}} \ltimes b = \underbrace{t \ltimes s \ltimes t \ltimes \dots}_{m/2+1 \text{ factors}} \ltimes b.$$

Case 6. $sb = bt, tb = bs$, $J = K$, m is odd, $\Omega \cap I_* = \{\xi_0 = \xi_0' = b, \xi_m = \xi_m' = \tilde{b}, \xi_{2i}, \xi_{2i}' | 0 \leq i \leq (m-1)/2\}$, where $\xi_2 = stb$, $\xi_4 = tstsb$, $\xi_6 = stststb$, $\dots$; $\xi_2' = tsb$, $\xi_4' = ststb$, $\xi_6' = tststsb$, $\dots$; $\ell(\xi_{2i}) = \ell(\xi_{2i}') = \ell(b) + 2i$; $\xi_m = \xi_m' = b\mathfrak{s}_m = b\mathfrak{t}_m = \mathfrak{s}_m b = \mathfrak{t}_m b$; $\ell(\xi_m) = \ell(\xi_m') = \ell(b) + m$. In this case, using a similar argument as in Case 4, we can get that

$$\tilde{b} = \underbrace{s \ltimes t \ltimes s \ltimes \dots}_{(m+1)/2 \text{ factors}} \ltimes b = \underbrace{t \ltimes s \ltimes t \ltimes \dots}_{(m+1)/2 \text{ factors}} \ltimes b.$$

Case 7. $sb = bt, tb = bs$, $J = K$, m is even, $\Omega \cap I_* = \{\xi_0 = \xi_0' = b, \xi_m = \xi_m' = \tilde{b}, \xi_{2i}, \xi_{2i}' | 0 \leq i \leq m/2\}$, where $\xi_2 = stb$, $\xi_4 = tstsb$, $\xi_6 = stststb$, $\dots$; $\xi_2' = tsb$, $\xi_4' = ststb$, $\xi_6' = tststsb$, $\dots$; $\ell(\xi_{2i}) = \ell(\xi_{2i}') = \ell(b) + 2i$. In this case, using a similar argument as in Case 4, we can get that

$$\tilde{b} = \underbrace{s \ltimes t \ltimes s \ltimes \dots}_{m/2 \text{ factors}} \ltimes b = \underbrace{t \ltimes s \ltimes t \ltimes \dots}_{m/2 \text{ factors}} \ltimes b.$$

In each of the above seven cases, one can check that $\{x \in \Omega \cap I_* | sx < x > tx\} = \{\tilde{b}\}$. It follows that $\tilde{b} = w$.

2.13. **Lemma.** *Let W be the Weyl group of a Kac–Moody algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ corresponding to a symmetrizable generalized Cartan matrix. Let $\langle -,-\rangle$ be the invariant bilinear form on $\mathfrak{h}^*$, where $\mathfrak{h}$ is the maximal toral subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. Let α,β be two simple roots such that $\langle\alpha,\beta\rangle\neq 0$. Suppose that $w\in W$, $w(\alpha)\in\{\pm\alpha\}$, $w(\beta)\in\{\pm\beta\}$. Then $w(\alpha)=\alpha$ if and only if $w(\beta)=\beta$; and $w(\alpha)=-\alpha$ if and only if $w(\beta)=-\beta$.*

Proof. This follows easily from the equality $\langle w(\alpha),w(\beta)\rangle=\langle\alpha,\beta\rangle$. □

3. Weyl groups of type D_n

In this section we study the braid I_*-transformations between reduced I_*-expressions of involutions in the Weyl group $W(D_n)$ of type D_n. We shall present a complete list of basic braid I_*-transformations in Definition 3.14 and show in Theorem 3.17 that any two reduced I_*-expressions for an involution in $W(D_n)$ can be transformed into each other through a series of basic braid I_*-transformations. Throughout this section, we assume that $*=\mathrm{id}$.

Let $W(D_n)$ be the Weyl group of type D_n. It is generated by the simple reflections $\{s_u,s_1,\cdots,s_{n-1}\}$ which satisfy the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&s_u^2=1=s_i^2,\quad for\ 1\le i\le n-1,\\
&s_us_2s_u=s_2s_us_2,\quad s_is_{i+1}s_i=s_{i+1}s_is_{i+1},\quad for\ 1\le i\le n-2,\\
&s_us_1=s_1s_u,\quad s_us_i=s_is_u,\quad for\ 3\le i\le n-1,\\
&s_is_j=s_js_i,\quad for\ 1\le i<j-1\le n-2.
\end{aligned}$$

Alternatively, $W(D_n)$ can be (cf. [**1, 4**]) realized as the subgroup of the permutations on the set $\{1,-1,2,-2,\cdots,n,-n\}$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sigma(i)=j \text{ if and only if } \sigma(-i)=-j \text{ for any } i,j\text{; and}\\ &\#\{1\le i\le n|\sigma(i)<0\} \text{ is even.}\end{aligned}\tag{3.1}$$

In particular, under this identification, we have that

$$s_u=(1,-2)(-1,2),\qquad s_i=(i,i+1)(-i,-i-1),\ \ for\ 1\le i<n.$$

The subgroup generated by $s_1,s_2,\cdots,s_{n-1}$ (or $s_u,s_2,\cdots,s_{n-1}$) can be identified with the symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_n$.

Let $\varepsilon_1,\cdots,\varepsilon_n$ be the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$. We set $u:=\varepsilon_1+\varepsilon_2$, $\alpha_i:=\varepsilon_{i+1}-\varepsilon_i$ for each $1\le i<n$. For each $1\le i\le n$, we define $\varepsilon_{-i}:=-\varepsilon_i$. Then $W(D_n)$ acts on the set $\{\varepsilon_i|i=-n,\cdots,-2,-1,1,2,\cdots,n\}$ via $\sigma(\varepsilon_i):=\varepsilon_{\sigma(i)}$. Let

$$\Phi:=\{\pm\varepsilon_i\pm\varepsilon_j|1\le i<j\le n\},\ \ E:=\mathbb{R}\text{-Span}\{v|v\in\Phi\}.$$

Then Φ is the root system of type D_n in E with $W(D_n)$ being its Weyl group. We choose $\Delta:=\{u,\alpha_i|1\le i<n\}$ to be the set of the simple roots. Then $\Phi^+=\{\varepsilon_j\pm\varepsilon_i|1\le i<j\le n\}$ is the set of positive roots. For any $0\neq\alpha\in E$, we write $\alpha>0$ if $\alpha=\sum_{\beta\in\Delta}k_\beta\beta$ with $k_\beta\ge 0$ for each β.

For any $w\in W(D_n)$ and $\alpha\in\Delta$, it is well-known that

$$ws_\alpha w^{-1}=s_{w(\alpha)},\tag{3.2}$$

where $s_{w(\alpha)}$ is the reflection with respect to hyperplane which is orthogonal to $w(\alpha)$.

3.3. **Lemma.** *Let $w\in W(D_n)$ and $1\le i<n$. Then*
1) $ws_i<w$ if and only if $w(\varepsilon_{i+1}-\varepsilon_i)<0$;
2) $ws_u<w$ if and only if $w(\varepsilon_1+\varepsilon_2)<0$.

3.4. **Lemma.** *Let $W = W(D_n)$ be the Weyl group of type D_n. Let $w \in I_*$ be an involution. In the notations of Lemma 2.12 and the discussion after it, assume that $s = s_\alpha, t = s_\beta$ for some $\alpha \neq \beta \in \Delta$ with*

$$(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}), (\alpha_{i+1}, \alpha_i), (\alpha_2, u), (u, \alpha_2) | 1 \leq i < n-1\}.$$

Then the Case 4 happens if and only if $m = 3$ and either

a) *$b = 1$; or $b = s_\gamma \ltimes b_1$ with $\gamma \in \Delta$, $b_1 \in I_*$ and $\rho(b) = \rho(b_1) + 1$ and $s_\gamma s_\alpha = s_\alpha s_\gamma$, $s_\gamma s_\beta = s_\beta s_\gamma$; or*

b) *$(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}), (\alpha_{i+1}, \alpha_i)\}$, $2 \leq i < n-1$, $b = s_{i-1} \ltimes s_i \ltimes s_{i+1} \ltimes d$ or $b = s_{i+2} \ltimes s_{i+1} \ltimes s_i \ltimes d$, where $d \in I_*$ and $\rho(b) = \rho(d) + 3$; or*

c) *$(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(\alpha_1, \alpha_2), (\alpha_2, \alpha_1)\}$, $b = s_3 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes d$, where $d \in I_*$ and $\rho(b) = \rho(d) + 3$; or*

d) *$(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(u, \alpha_2), (\alpha_2, u)\}$, $b = s_3 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u \ltimes d$, where $d \in I_*$ and $\rho(b) = \rho(d) + 3$.*

Proof. It is clear that the Case 4 happens if and only if $m = 3$ and $b(\alpha) = \pm\alpha, b(\beta) = \pm\beta$ (by 3.2). By assumption, both (s_β, s_α, b) and (s_α, s_β, b) are reduced I_*-sequences. Applying Corollary 2.3 and Corollary 2.4, we can deduce that $b(\alpha) > 0 < b(\beta)$. It follows that $b(\alpha) = \alpha, b(\beta) = \beta$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}), (u, \alpha_2) | 1 \leq i < n-1\}$.

Suppose that a) does not happen. There are only the following possibilities:

Case 1. $(\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1})$ for some $1 \leq i < n-1$. Then $b(i) = i, b(i+1) = i+1, b(i+2) = i+2$. By Lemma 3.3 and the assumption that a) does not happen we can deduce that

$$b(1) < b(2) < \cdots < b(i-1),\ b(i+3) < b(i+4) < \cdots < b(n). \tag{3.5}$$

Suppose that $i \geq 3$ and b) does not happen. We claim that $b(i-1) \leq i-1$ and $b(i+3) \geq i+3$. In fact, if $b(i-1) > i-1$ then we can deduce that $b(i-1) \geq i+3$. In this case,

$$b^{-1}(\alpha_{i-1}) = b(\alpha_{i-1}) = b(\varepsilon_i) - b(\varepsilon_{i-1}) = \varepsilon_i - b(\varepsilon_{i-1}) < 0,$$

and $b(\alpha_{i-1}) \neq \pm\alpha_{i-1}$, which implies that $bs_{i-1} \neq s_{i-1}b$. By Corollary 2.3, we get that $s_{i-1} \ltimes b = s_{i-1}bs_{i-1}$ and $\rho(b) = \rho(s_{i-1} \ltimes b) + 1$.

Now,

$$(s_{i-1}bs_{i-1})^{-1}(\alpha_i) = (s_{i-1}bs_{i-1})(\varepsilon_{i+1} - \varepsilon_i) = \varepsilon_{i+1} - s_{i-1}b(\varepsilon_{i-1}) < 0,$$

and $(s_{i-1}bs_{i-1})(\alpha_i) \neq \pm\alpha_i$ implies that $(s_{i-1}bs_{i-1})s_i \neq s_i(s_{i-1}bs_{i-1})$. It follows from Corollary 2.3 that

$$s_i \ltimes (s_{i-1} \ltimes b) = s_i s_{i-1} b s_{i-1} s_i, \quad \rho(b) = \rho(s_i \ltimes s_{i-1} \ltimes b) + 2.$$

Finally,

$$(s_i s_{i-1} b s_{i-1} s_i)^{-1}(\alpha_{i+1}) = (s_i s_{i-1} b s_{i-1} s_i)(\varepsilon_{i+2} - \varepsilon_{i+1}) = \varepsilon_{i+2} - s_i s_{i-1} b(\varepsilon_{i-1}) < 0,$$

and $(s_i s_{i-1} b s_{i-1} s_i)(\alpha_{i+1}) \neq \pm\alpha_{i+1}$ implies that

$$(s_i s_{i-1} b s_{i-1} s_i) s_{i+1} \neq s_{i+1}(s_i s_{i-1} b s_{i-1} s_i).$$

It follows from Corollary 2.3 that

$$s_{i+1} \ltimes (s_i \ltimes (s_{i-1} \ltimes b) = s_{i+1} s_i s_{i-1} b s_{i-1} s_i s_{i+1}, \quad \rho(b) = \rho(s_{i+1} \ltimes s_i \ltimes s_{i-1} \ltimes b) + 3.$$

Set $d := s_{i+1} \ltimes s_i \ltimes s_{i-1} \ltimes b$. Then $b = s_{i-1} \ltimes s_i \ltimes s_{i+1} \ltimes d$ and this is b) which contradicts to our assumption.

In a similar way, if $b(i+3) < i+3$ then we can deduce that $b = s_{i+2} \ltimes s_{i+1} \ltimes s_i \ltimes d$ with $d \in I_*$ and $\rho(b) = \rho(d) + 3$, which contradicts to our assumption again. This proves our claim.

Now note that $i \geq 3$. By Lemma 3.3 and the assumption that a) does not happen again we can deduce that $b(1) + b(2) > 0$. Combining the claim with (3.1), (3.5) and the fact

that $b(j) = j$ for any $i \leq j \leq i+3$ one can deduce that $b = 1$, a contradiction to our assumption that a) does not hold. This finishes the proof in Case 1 when $i \geq 3$.

If $i = 1$ or $i = 2$, one can use a similar argument to prove that either c) holds, or b) holds, or $b = 1$ as required. This completes the proof of Case 1.

Case 2. $(\alpha, \beta) = (u, \alpha_2)$. Then $b(1) = 1, b(2) = 2, b(3) = 3$. By Lemma 3.3 and the assumption that a) does not happen we can get that

$$b(4) < b(5) < \cdots < b(n). \tag{3.6}$$

Suppose that $b(4) < 0$. Then $b(4) \leq -4$ as $\{1, 2, 3\} = \{b(1), b(2), b(3)\}$ and $b^2 = 1$. Thus $b(\alpha_3) = b(\varepsilon_4 - \varepsilon_3) = b(\varepsilon_4) - \varepsilon_3 < 0$ and $b(\alpha_3) \neq \pm\alpha_3$. Therefore $bs_3 \neq s_3 b$. By Corollary 2.3, we get that $s_3 \ltimes b = s_3 b s_3$ and $\rho(b) = \rho(s_3 \ltimes b) + 1$. Next,

$$(s_3 b s_3)^{-1}(\alpha_2) = (s_3 b s_3)(\varepsilon_3 - \varepsilon_2) = s_3 b(\varepsilon_4) - \varepsilon_2 < 0,$$

and $(s_3 b s_3)(\alpha_2) \neq \pm\alpha_2$ (because $b(4) \leq -4$). This implies that $(s_3 b s_3)s_2 \neq s_2(s_3 b s_3)$. It follows from Corollary 2.3 that

$$s_2 \ltimes (s_3 \ltimes b) = s_2 s_3 b s_3 s_2, \quad \rho(b) = \rho(s_2 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes b) + 2.$$

Now we have that $(s_2 s_3 b s_3 s_2)^{-1}(u) = (s_2 s_3 b s_3 s_2)(\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2) = \varepsilon_1 + s_2 s_3 b(\varepsilon_4) < 0$ (because $b(4) \leq -4$), and $(s_2 s_3 b s_3 s_2)(u) \neq \pm u$ implies that

$$(s_2 s_3 b s_3 s_2) s_u \neq s_u (s_2 s_3 b s_3 s_2).$$

It follows from Corollary 2.3 that

$$s_u \ltimes (s_2 \ltimes (s_3 \ltimes b) = s_u s_2 s_3 b s_3 s_2 s_u, \quad \rho(b) = \rho(s_u \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes b) + 3.$$

Set $d := s_u \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes b$. Then $b = s_3 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u \ltimes d$ and this is d) as required.

It remains to consider the case when $b(4) > 0$ and hence $b(4) \geq 4$. In this case, by (3.6) again, we can deduce that $b = 1$ which contradicts to our assumption. This completes the proof of the lemma. □

3.7. **Lemma.** *Let $W = W(D_n)$ be the Weyl group of type D_n. Let $w \in W$ be an involution. In the notations of Lemma 2.12 and the discussion after it, assume that $s = s_\alpha, t = s_\beta$ for some $\alpha \neq \beta \in \Delta$ with*

$$(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}), (\alpha_{i+1}, \alpha_i), (\alpha_2, u), (u, \alpha_2) | 1 \leq i < n-1\}.$$

Then the Case 6 happens if and only if $m = 3$ and either

a) $b = s_\gamma \ltimes b_1$ *with* $\gamma \in \Delta$, $b_1 \in I_*$ *and* $\rho(b) = \rho(b_1) + 1$ *and* $s_\gamma s_\alpha = s_\alpha s_\gamma$, $s_\gamma s_\beta = s_\beta s_\gamma$*; or*
b) $(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}), (\alpha_{i+1}, \alpha_i)\}$, $1 \leq i < n-1$, $b = s_{i-1} \ltimes s_i \ltimes s_{i+1} \ltimes d$ *or* $b = s_{i+2} \ltimes s_{i+1} \ltimes s_i \ltimes d$, *where* $d \in I_*$ *and* $\rho(b) = \rho(d) + 3$*; or*
c) $(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(\alpha_2, \alpha_3), (\alpha_3, \alpha_2)\}$, $b = s_u \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes d$, *or* $(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(u, \alpha_2), (\alpha_2, u)\}$, $b = s_3 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u \ltimes d$, *where* $d \in I_*$ *and* $\rho(b) = \rho(d) + 3$*; or*
d) $(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(\alpha_2, \alpha_3), (\alpha_3, \alpha_2)\}$, $b = s_u \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_3$ *and* $\rho(b) = 6$*; or*
e) $(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(\alpha_1, \alpha_2), (\alpha_2, \alpha_1)\}$, $b = s_u \ltimes s_3 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_u \ltimes s_3$ *and* $\rho(b) = 6$*; or*
f) $(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(u, \alpha_2), (\alpha_2, u)\}$, $b = s_1 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_3$ *and* $\rho(b) = 6$*; or*
g) $(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(\alpha_2, \alpha_3), (\alpha_3, \alpha_2)\}$,

$$b = s_u \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_4 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes s_u \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_4.$$

Proof. It is clear that the Case 6 happens if and only if $m = 3$ and $b(\alpha) = \pm\beta$ (by (3.2)). Note that $b(\alpha) = \pm\beta$ if and only if $b(\beta) = \pm\alpha$ because $b^2 = 1$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}), (u, \alpha_2) | 1 \leq i < n-1\}$.

By assumption, $s_\beta \ltimes s_\alpha \ltimes b$ is a reduced I_*-sequence. Applying Corollary 2.3 and Corollary 2.4, we can deduce that $b(\alpha) > 0$. It follows that $b(\alpha) = \beta$.

Suppose that a) does not happen. There are only the following possibilities:

Case 1. $(\alpha,\beta)=(\alpha_i,\alpha_{i+1})$ for some $3\le i<n-1$. Then $b(i)=-(i+2), b(i+2)=-i, b(i+1)=-(i+1)$. By Lemma 3.3 we can get that

(3.8) $b(1)<b(2)<\cdots<b(i-1),\ b(1)+b(2)>0,\ b(i+3)<b(i+4)<\cdots<b(n).$

Note that (3.8) implies that $b(i-1)>0$. Thus

$$b^{-1}(\alpha_{i-1})=b(\alpha_{i-1})=b(\varepsilon_i)-b(\varepsilon_{i-1})=-\varepsilon_{i+2}-b(\varepsilon_{i-1})<0.$$

Furthermore, $b(\alpha_{i-1})\neq\pm\alpha_{i-1}$ implies that $bs_{i-1}\neq s_{i-1}b$. By Corollary 2.3, we get that $s_{i-1}\ltimes b=s_{i-1}bs_{i-1}$ and $\rho(b)=\rho(s_{i-1}\ltimes b)+1$.

Now,

$$(s_{i-1}bs_{i-1})^{-1}(\alpha_i)=(s_{i-1}bs_{i-1})(\varepsilon_{i+1}-\varepsilon_i)=-\varepsilon_{i+1}-s_{i-1}b(\varepsilon_{i-1})<0,$$

and $(s_{i-1}bs_{i-1})(\alpha_i)\neq\pm\alpha_i$ implies that $(s_{i-1}bs_{i-1})s_i\neq s_i(s_{i-1}bs_{i-1})$. It follows from Corollary 2.3 that

$$s_i\ltimes(s_{i-1}\ltimes b)=s_is_{i-1}bs_{i-1}s_i,\quad \rho(b)=\rho(s_i\ltimes s_{i-1}\ltimes b)+2.$$

Finally,

$$(s_is_{i-1}bs_{i-1}s_i)^{-1}(\alpha_{i+1})=(s_is_{i-1}bs_{i-1}s_i)(\varepsilon_{i+2}-\varepsilon_{i+1})=-\varepsilon_{i-1}-s_is_{i-1}b(\varepsilon_{i-1})<0,$$

and $(s_is_{i-1}bs_{i-1}s_i)(\alpha_{i+1})\neq\pm\alpha_{i+1}$ implies that

$$(s_is_{i-1}bs_{i-1}s_i)s_{i+1}\neq s_{i+1}(s_is_{i-1}bs_{i-1}s_i).$$

It follows from Corollary 2.3 that

$$s_{i+1}\ltimes(s_i\ltimes(s_{i-1}\ltimes b)=s_{i+1}s_is_{i-1}bs_{i-1}s_is_{i+1},\quad \rho(b)=\rho(s_{i+1}\ltimes s_i\ltimes s_{i-1}\ltimes b)+3.$$

Set $d:=s_{i+1}\ltimes s_i\ltimes s_{i-1}\ltimes b$. Then $b=s_{i-1}\ltimes s_i\ltimes s_{i+1}\ltimes d$ and this is b) as required.

Case 2. $(\alpha,\beta)=(\alpha_2,\alpha_3)$. Then $b(2)=-4, b(4)=-2, b(3)=-3$. By Lemma 3.3 we can get that

(3.9) $$b(5)<b(6)<\cdots<b(n).$$

Suppose that $b(5)<-1$. Then we must have that $b(5)\le-5$ as $\{-2,-3,-4\}=\{b(3),b(4),b(2)\}$.

Suppose that $b(5)\le-6$. In this case, $b^{-1}(\alpha_4)=b(\varepsilon_5-\varepsilon_4)=b(\varepsilon_5)+\varepsilon_2<0$ and $b(\alpha_4)\neq\pm\alpha_4$. Therefore $bs_4\neq s_4b$. By Corollary 2.3, we get that $s_4\ltimes b=s_4bs_4$ and $\rho(b)=\rho(s_4\ltimes b)+1$. Next,

$$(s_4bs_4)^{-1}(\alpha_3)=(s_4bs_4)(\varepsilon_4-\varepsilon_3)=s_4b(\varepsilon_5)+\varepsilon_3<0,$$

and $(s_4bs_4)(\alpha_3)\neq\pm\alpha_3$ (because $b(5)\le-6$). This implies that $(s_4bs_4)s_3\neq s_3(s_4bs_4)$. It follows from Corollary 2.3 that

$$s_3\ltimes(s_4\ltimes b)=s_3s_4bs_4s_3,\quad \rho(b)=\rho(s_3\ltimes s_4\ltimes b)+2.$$

Finally,

$$(s_3s_4bs_4s_3)^{-1}(\alpha_2)=(s_3s_4bs_4s_3)(\varepsilon_3-\varepsilon_2)=s_3s_4b(\varepsilon_5)+\varepsilon_5<0,$$

and $(s_3s_4bs_4s_3)(\alpha_2)\neq\pm\alpha_2$ implies that

$$(s_3s_4bs_4s_3)s_2\neq s_2(s_3s_4bs_4s_3).$$

It follows from Corollary 2.3 that

$$s_2\ltimes(s_3\ltimes(s_4\ltimes b)=s_2s_3s_4bs_4s_3s_2,\quad \rho(b)=\rho(s_2\ltimes s_3\ltimes s_4\ltimes b)+3.$$

Set $d:=s_4\ltimes s_3\ltimes s_2\ltimes b$. Then $b=s_4\ltimes s_3\ltimes s_2\ltimes d$ and this is b) as required.

Suppose that $b(5)=-5$, then by (3.9) and the fact that $b^2=1$ we can deduce that $b(1)\in\{\pm1,\pm6\}$. Using a similar argument as in the last paragraph, we can prove that if $b(1)=6$ then $b=s_1\ltimes s_2\ltimes s_3\ltimes d$ with $\rho(b)=\rho(d)+3$; while if $b(1)=-6$ then

$b = s_u \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes d$ with $\rho(b) = \rho(d) + 3$. These are b) and c) respectively as required. If $b(1) = 1$, then by (3.9) again we can deduce that $b(i) = i$ for any $i \geq 6$. In this subcase,

$$\begin{aligned} b &= s_2s_3s_2(s_3s_2s_us_1s_2s_3)(s_4s_3s_2s_us_1s_2s_3s_4)(s_2s_us_1s_2)(s_us_1) \\ &= s_us_1s_2s_3s_4s_3s_2s_us_1s_2s_3s_4s_us_1s_2s_us_1 \\ &= s_u \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_4 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes s_u \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_4, \end{aligned}$$

which is g) as required. Finally if $b(1) = -1$, then by (3.9) we can further deduce that $b(i) = i$ for any $i \geq 6$. However, this is impossible by sign consideration (cf. 3.1).

Suppose that $b(5) = -1$. Then $b(u) = b(\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2) = -\varepsilon_5 - \varepsilon_4 < 0$ and $b(u) \neq \pm u$. Therefore $bs_u \neq s_ub$. By Corollary 2.3, we get that $s_u \ltimes b = s_ubs_u$ and $\rho(b) = \rho(s_u \ltimes b) + 1$. Next,

$$(s_ubs_u)^{-1}(\alpha_2) = (s_ubs_u)(\varepsilon_3 - \varepsilon_2) = -\varepsilon_3 - \varepsilon_5 < 0,$$

and $(s_ubs_u)(\alpha_2) \neq \pm\alpha_2$. This implies that $(s_ubs_u)s_2 \neq s_2(s_ubs_u)$. It follows from Corollary 2.3 that

$$s_2 \ltimes (s_u \ltimes b) = s_2s_ubs_us_2, \quad \rho(b) = \rho(s_2 \ltimes s_u \ltimes b) + 2.$$

Now we have that $(s_2s_ubs_us_2)(\alpha_3) = (s_2s_ubs_us_2)(\varepsilon_4 - \varepsilon_3) = \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_5 < 0$, and $(s_2s_ubs_us_2)(\alpha_3) \neq \pm\alpha_3$ implies that

$$(s_2s_ubs_us_2)s_3 \neq s_3(s_2s_ubs_us_2).$$

It follows from Corollary 2.3 that

$$s_3 \ltimes (s_2 \ltimes (s_u \ltimes b) = s_3s_2s_ubs_us_2s_3, \quad \rho(b) = \rho(s_3 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u \ltimes b) + 3.$$

Set $d := s_3 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u \ltimes b$. Then $b = s_u \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes d$ and this is c) as required.

Therefore, we can assume that $b(5) > 0$. It follows from (3.9) and the fact that $b^2 = 1$ that $b(1) = -1$ and $b(i) = i$ for any $5 \leq i \leq n$. We can deduce that

$$b = (s_us_1)(s_2s_us_1s_2)(s_3s_2s_us_1s_2s_3)s_2s_3s_2 = s_u \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_3,$$

and $\rho(b) = 5$, which is d) as required. In fact, one can check directly that

$$\begin{aligned} s_2 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes s_u \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_3 &= s_2s_3s_us_1s_2s_us_1s_3s_2s_1s_us_3 \\ &= s_3 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_3 \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Case 3. $(\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$. Then $b(1) = -3, b(3) = -1, b(2) = -2$. By Lemma 3.3 again, we can get that

$$b(4) < b(5) < \cdots < b(n). \tag{3.11}$$

Applying (3.11) it is easy to see that $b(4) < 0$ in this case. Then we must have that $b(4) \leq -4$ as $\{-1, -2, -3\} = \{b(1), b(2), b(3)\}$. Assume that $b(4) \leq -5$. Then $b(\alpha_3) = b(\varepsilon_4 - \varepsilon_3) = b(\varepsilon_4) + \varepsilon_1 < 0$ and $b(\alpha_3) \neq \pm\alpha_3$. Therefore $bs_3 \neq s_3b$. By Corollary 2.3, we get that $s_3 \ltimes b = s_3bs_3$ and $\rho(b) = \rho(s_3 \ltimes b) + 1$. Next,

$$(s_3bs_3)^{-1}(\alpha_2) = (s_3bs_3)(\varepsilon_3 - \varepsilon_2) = s_3b(\varepsilon_4) + \varepsilon_2 < 0,$$

and $(s_3bs_3)(\alpha_2) \neq \pm\alpha_2$ (because $b(4) \leq -5$). This implies that $(s_3bs_3)s_2 \neq s_2(s_3bs_3)$. It follows from Corollary 2.3 that

$$s_2 \ltimes (s_3 \ltimes b) = s_2s_3bs_3s_2, \quad \rho(b) = \rho(s_2 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes b) + 2.$$

Now we have that $(s_2s_3bs_3s_2)(\alpha_1) = (s_2s_3bs_3s_2)(\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1) = s_2s_3b(\varepsilon_4) + \varepsilon_4 < 0$, and $(s_2s_3bs_3s_2)(\alpha_1) \neq \pm\alpha_1$ implies that

$$(s_2s_3bs_3s_2)s_1 \neq s_1(s_2s_3bs_3s_2).$$

It follows from Corollary 2.3 that

$$s_1 \ltimes (s_2 \ltimes (s_3 \ltimes b) = s_1s_2s_3bs_3s_2s_1, \quad \rho(b) = \rho(s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes b) + 3.$$

Set $d := s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes b$. Then $b = s_3 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes d$ and this is b) as required..

It remains to consider the case when $b(4) = -4$. In this case, by (3.11) again, we can deduce that $b(j) = j$ for any $j \geq 5$. It follows that

$$b = (s_u s_1)(s_2 s_u s_1 s_2)(s_3 s_2 s_u s_1 s_2 s_3) s_1 s_2 s_1 = s_u \ltimes s_3 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_u \ltimes s_3,$$

and $\rho(b) = 6$, which is e) as required.

Case 4. $(\alpha, \beta) = (u, \alpha_2)$. Then $b(1) = 3, b(3) = 1, b(2) = -2$. By Lemma 3.3 again, we can get that

$$b(1) + b(2) > 0, \;\; b(4) < b(5) < \cdots < b(n). \tag{3.12}$$

Applying (3.12) it is easy to see that $b(4) < 0$ in this case. Then we must have that $b(4) \leq -4$ as $\{-1, -2, -3\} = \{b(-1), b(2), b(-3)\}$. Assume that $b(4) \leq -5$. Then $b(\alpha_3) = b(\varepsilon_4 - \varepsilon_3) = b(\varepsilon_4) - \varepsilon_1 < 0$ and $b(\alpha_3) \neq \pm\alpha_3$. Therefore $bs_3 \neq s_3 b$. By Corollary 2.3, we get that $s_3 \ltimes b = s_3 b s_3$ and $\rho(b) = \rho(s_3 \ltimes b) + 1$. Next,

$$(s_3 b s_3)^{-1}(\alpha_2) = (s_3 b s_3)(\varepsilon_3 - \varepsilon_2) = s_3 b(\varepsilon_4) + \varepsilon_2 < 0,$$

and $(s_3 b s_3)(\alpha_2) \neq \pm\alpha_2$ (because $b(4) \leq -5$). This implies that $(s_3 b s_3) s_2 \neq s_2 (s_3 b s_3)$. It follows from Corollary 2.3 that

$$s_2 \ltimes (s_3 \ltimes b) = s_2 s_3 b s_3 s_2, \quad \rho(b) = \rho(s_2 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes b) + 2.$$

Now we have that $(s_2 s_3 b s_3 s_2)(u) = (s_2 s_3 b s_3 s_2)(\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2) = \varepsilon_4 + s_2 s_3 b(\varepsilon_4) < 0$ (because $b(4) \leq -5$), and $(s_2 s_3 b s_3 s_2)(u) \neq \pm u$ implies that

$$(s_2 s_3 b s_3 s_2) s_u \neq s_u (s_2 s_3 b s_3 s_2).$$

It follows from Corollary 2.3 that

$$s_u \ltimes (s_2 \ltimes (s_3 \ltimes b) = s_u s_2 s_3 b s_3 s_2 s_u, \quad \rho(b) = \rho(s_u \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes b) + 3.$$

Set $d := s_u \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes b$. Then $b = s_3 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u \ltimes d$ and this is c) as required..

It remains to consider the case when $b(4) = -4$. In this case, by (3.12) again, we can deduce that $b(j) = j$ for any $j \geq 5$. It follows that

$$b = (s_u s_1)(s_3 s_2 s_u s_1 s_2 s_3) s_1 s_2 s_1 = s_1 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_3,$$

and $\rho(b) = 6$, which is e) as required. This completes the proof of the lemma. □

3.13. *Remark.* We consider reduce I_*-expressions for involutions in the Weyl group of type D_n. In this case, in addition to the basic braid I_*-transformations given by Proposition 2.10, one clearly has to add the following (right ends) transformations:

$$s_i \ltimes s_{i+1} \longleftrightarrow s_{i+1} \ltimes s_i, \;\; s_2 \ltimes s_u \longleftrightarrow s_u \ltimes s_2,$$
$$s_j \ltimes s_u \longleftrightarrow s_u \ltimes s_j, \;\; s_k \ltimes s_l \longleftrightarrow s_l \ltimes s_k,$$

where $1 \leq i < n-1$, $1 \leq j, k, l < n$, $j \neq 2$, $|k - l| > 1$. Given the result [**8**, Definition 2.12, Theorem 3.1] for the type A case, it is tempting to speculate that these are all the basic braid I_*-transformation for involutions in $W(D_n)$. However, it turns out that this is *NOT* the case. In fact, one has to add a new basic braid I_*-transformation in the case of type D_n, see the last transformation in Definition 3.14, which is a new phenomenon for type D_n.

3.14. **Definition.** By a basic braid I_*-transformation, we mean one of the following transformations and their inverses:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(s_{i_1},\cdots,s_{i_a},s_j,s_{j+1},s_j,s_{l_1},\cdots,s_{l_t},w)\longmapsto\\
&\qquad(s_{i_1},\cdots,s_{i_a},s_{j+1},s_j,s_{j+1},s_{l_1},\cdots,s_{l_t},w),\\
&(s_{i_1},\cdots,s_{i_a},s_u,s_2,s_u,s_{l_1},\cdots,s_{l_t},w)\longmapsto\\
&\qquad(s_{i_1},\cdots,s_{i_a},s_2,s_u,s_2,s_{l_1},\cdots,s_{l_t},w),\\
&(s_{i_1},s_{i_2},\cdots,s_{i_a},s_b,s_c,s_{l_1},\cdots,s_{l_t},w')\longmapsto\\
&\qquad(s_{i_1},s_{i_2},\cdots,s_{i_a},s_c,s_b,s_{l_1},\cdots,s_{l_t},w'),\\
&(s_{i_1},s_{i_2},\cdots,s_{i_a},s_d,s_u,s_{l_1},\cdots,s_{l_t},w')\longmapsto\\
&\qquad(s_{i_1},s_{i_2},\cdots,s_{i_a},s_u,s_d,s_{l_1},\cdots,s_{l_t},w'),\\
&(s_{i_1},s_{i_2},\cdots,s_{i_a},s_k,s_{k+1})\longmapsto(s_{i_1},s_{i_2},\cdots,s_{i_a},s_{k+1},s_k),\\
&(s_{i_1},s_{i_2},\cdots,s_{i_a},s_2,s_u)\longmapsto(s_{i_1},s_{i_2},\cdots,s_{i_a},s_u,s_2),\\
&(s_{i_1},s_{i_2},\cdots,s_{i_a},s_2,s_3,s_u,s_1,s_2,s_u,s_1,s_3)\longmapsto\\
&\qquad(s_{i_1},s_{i_2},\cdots,s_{i_a},s_3,s_2,s_u,s_1,s_2,s_u,s_1,s_3),
\end{aligned}$$

where $1\neq w,w'\in I_*$, $t\geq 0$, $i_1,\cdots,i_a,l_1,\cdots,l_t\in\{u,1,2,\cdots,n-1\}$, $1\leq j,k<n-1$, $1\leq b<c-1<n-1$, $1\leq d<n$ with $d\neq 2$, and all the sequences appeared above are reduced sequences. We define a braid I_*-transformation to be the composition of a series of basic braid I_*-transformations.

Let $w\in I_*$ and $s_{i_1},\cdots,s_{i_k}\in S$. By definition, it is clear that $(s_{i_1},\cdots,s_{i_k},w)$ is a reduced sequence if and only if $(s_{i_1},\cdots,s_{i_k},s_{j_1},\cdots,s_{j_t})$ is a reduced sequence for some (and any) reduced I_*-expression $(s_{j_1},\cdots,s_{j_t})$ of w.

3.15. **Definition.** Let $(s_{i_1},\cdots,s_{i_k},w),(s_{j_1},\cdots,s_{j_l},u)$ be two reduced I_*-sequences, where $w,u\in I_*$. We shall write $(s_{i_1},\cdots,s_{i_k},w)\longleftrightarrow(s_{j_1},\cdots,s_{j_l},u)$ whenever there exists a series of braid I_*-transformations which transform

$$(s_{i_1},\cdots,s_{i_k},s_{l_1},\cdots,s_{l_b})$$

into $(s_{j_1},\cdots,s_{j_l},s_{p_1},\cdots,s_{p_c})$, where $(s_{l_1},\cdots,s_{l_b})$ and $(s_{p_1},\cdots,s_{p_c})$ are some reduced I_*-expressions of w and u respectively. Moreover, we shall also write

$$(i_1,\cdots,i_k)\longleftrightarrow(j_1,\cdots,j_k)$$

whenever $(s_{i_1},\cdots,s_{i_k})\longleftrightarrow(s_{j_1},\cdots,s_{j_k})$.

3.16. **Theorem.** *Let $(s_{i_1},\cdots,s_{i_k}),(s_{j_1},\cdots,s_{j_k})$ be two reduced I_*-sequences which can be transformed into each other through a series of basic braid I_*-transformations. Then*

$$s_{i_1}\ltimes s_{i_2}\ltimes\cdots\ltimes s_{i_k}=s_{j_1}\ltimes s_{j_2}\ltimes\cdots\ltimes s_{j_k}.$$

Proof. In fact, this follows easily from Proposition 2.10 and (3.10). □

A well-known classical fact of Matsumoto ([**14**]) says that any two reduced expressions for an element in any Weyl group can be transformed into each other through a series of basic braid transformations. In Theorem 3.16 we have shown that any basic braid I_*-transformations on reduced I_*-expression for a given $w\in I_*$ do not change the element w itself. The following theorem says something more than this.

3.17. **Theorem.** *Let $w\in I_*$. Then any two reduced I_*-expressions for w can be transformed into each other through a series of basic braid I_*-transformations.*

Proof. We prove the theorem by induction on $\rho(w)$. Suppose that the theorem holds for any $w\in I_*$ with $\rho(w)\leq k$. Let $w\in I_*$ with $\rho(w)=k+1$. Let $(s_{i_0},s_{i_1},s_{i_2},\cdots,s_{i_k})$ and $(s_{j_0},s_{j_1},s_{j_2},\cdots,s_{j_k})$ be two reduced I_*-expressions for $w\in I_*$. We need to prove that

$$(i_0,i_1,\cdots,i_k)\longleftrightarrow(j_0,j_1,\cdots,j_k). \tag{3.18}$$

For simplicity, we set $s = s_{i_0}, t = s_{j_0}$. Let m be the order of st. We make three useful observations:

Observation 1. If there exists some $s_\alpha \in S$ such that $(i_0, \dots, i_k) \longleftrightarrow (s_\alpha, \dots)$ and $(j_0, \dots, j_k) \longleftrightarrow (s_\alpha, \dots)$, then it is clear (by induction hypothesis and definition) that $(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_k) \longleftrightarrow (s_\alpha, \dots) \longleftrightarrow (j_0, j_1, \dots, j_k)$.

Observation 2. If $m = 3$, then we are in the situations of Cases 1,2,3,4,6 of Lemma 2.12. By Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.7, we claim that either (3.18) holds by Definition 3.14, or $(i_0, i_1, \cdots, i_k) \longleftrightarrow (s_\alpha, \dots)$ and $(j_0, j_1, \cdots, j_k) \longleftrightarrow (s_\alpha, \dots)$ for some $s_\alpha \in S$. In these cases, (3.18) follows from induction hypothesis.

In fact, our claim is easy to verify except in the cases e), f), g) in Lemma 3.7. For the case e), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&(s_2, s_3, s_u, s_1, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_3) \longleftrightarrow (s_2, s_1, s_u, s_3, s_2, s_1, s_u, s_3),\\
&(s_3, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_3)\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_3, s_2, s_1, s_u, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_3) \longleftrightarrow (s_1, s_3, s_2, s_1, s_u, s_2, s_1, s_3)\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_1, s_3, s_2, s_u, s_2, s_1, s_2, s_3) \longleftrightarrow (s_1, s_3, s_2, s_u, s_2, s_1, s_3, s_2)\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_1, s_3, s_2, s_u, s_2, s_3, s_1, s_2) \longleftrightarrow (s_1, s_3, s_2, s_u, s_2, s_3, s_2, s_1)\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_1, s_3, s_2, s_u, s_3, s_2, s_3, s_1) \longleftrightarrow (s_1, s_3, s_2, s_3, s_u, s_2, s_3, s_1)\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_1, s_2, s_3, s_2, s_u, s_2, s_3, s_1) \longleftrightarrow (s_1, s_2, s_3, s_u, s_2, s_u, s_3, s_1)\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_1, s_2, s_u, s_3, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_3) \longleftrightarrow (s_1, s_2, s_u, s_3, s_2, s_1, s_u, s_3),
\end{aligned}$$

as required.

For the case f), we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&(s_2, s_3, s_u, s_1, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_3) \longleftrightarrow (s_2, s_u, s_1, s_3, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_3),\\
&(s_3, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_3)\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_3, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_2, s_1, s_u, s_3) \longleftrightarrow (s_u, s_3, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_2, s_u, s_3)\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_u, s_3, s_2, s_1, s_2, s_u, s_2, s_3) \longleftrightarrow (s_u, s_3, s_2, s_1, s_2, s_u, s_3, s_2)\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_u, s_3, s_2, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_u, s_2) \longleftrightarrow (s_u, s_3, s_2, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_2, s_u)\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_u, s_3, s_2, s_1, s_3, s_2, s_3, s_u) \longleftrightarrow (s_u, s_3, s_2, s_3, s_1, s_2, s_u, s_3)\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_u, s_2, s_3, s_2, s_1, s_2, s_u, s_3) \longleftrightarrow (s_u, s_2, s_3, s_1, s_2, s_1, s_u, s_3)\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_u, s_2, s_1, s_3, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_3),
\end{aligned}$$

as required.

For the case g), we have that $k = m = 12$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
(i_1, \dots, i_{12}) &= (2, 3, u, 1, 2, 4, 3, u, 2, u, 1, 4)\\
(j_1, \dots, j_{12}) &= (3, 2, u, 1, 2, 4, 3, u, 2, u, 1, 4).
\end{aligned}$$

We can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&(s_2, s_3, b) = (s_2, s_3, s_u, s_1, s_2, s_4, s_3, s_u, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_4)\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_2, s_3, s_4, s_u, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_2, s_u, s_2, s_1, s_4) \longleftrightarrow (s_2, s_3, s_4, s_u, s_1, s_3, s_2, s_3, s_u, s_2, s_1, s_4)\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_2, s_3, s_4, s_3, s_u, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_u, s_2, s_1, s_4) \longleftrightarrow (s_2, s_4, s_3, s_4, s_u, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_u, s_2, s_1, s_4)\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_4, s_2, s_3, s_4, s_u, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_u, s_2, s_1, s_4).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, using the definition of the braid I_*-transformations, we can get that

$$\begin{aligned}
&(s_3, s_2, b) = (s_3, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_2, s_4, s_3, s_u, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_4)\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_3, s_2, s_1, s_u, s_2, s_3, s_4, s_3, s_u, s_2, s_u, s_1) \longleftrightarrow (s_1, s_3, s_2, s_1, s_u, s_2, s_3, s_4, s_3, s_2, s_u, s_1)\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_1, s_3, s_4, s_2, s_1, s_u, s_2, s_3, s_4, s_2, s_u, s_1) \longleftrightarrow (s_1, s_3, s_4, s_2, s_1, s_u, s_2, s_3, s_2, s_4, s_u, s_1)\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_1, s_3, s_2, s_4, s_3, s_1, s_u, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_3, s_4) \longleftrightarrow (s_1, s_3, s_2, s_4, s_3, s_1, s_u, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_4, s_3)\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_1, s_3, s_2, s_4, s_3, s_4, s_1, s_u, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_3) \longleftrightarrow (s_1, s_3, s_2, s_3, s_4, s_3, s_1, s_u, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_3)\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4, (s_2, s_3, s_u, s_1, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_3)) \longleftrightarrow (s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4, (s_3, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_3))\\
\longleftrightarrow\ &(s_1, s_2, s_4, s_3, s_4, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_3) \longleftrightarrow (s_4, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_2, s_u, s_1, s_3).
\end{aligned}$$

So again we are in a position to apply the induction hypothesis. This completes the proof of our claim.

Observation 3. If there exists some $s_\alpha, s_\beta \in S$ such that $s_\alpha s_\beta$ has order 3 and $(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_k) \longleftrightarrow (s_\alpha, \dots)$, $(j_0, j_1, \dots, j_k) \longleftrightarrow (s_\beta, \dots)$, then it is clear (by Observation 2) that $(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_k) \longleftrightarrow (j_0, j_1, \dots, j_k)$.

Henceforth we assume that $m = 2$. That is, $st = ts$. By Lemma 2.1, $\rho(s_{j_0} \ltimes w) = \rho(s_{j_1} \ltimes s_{j_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{j_k}) = k < k+1$. It follows from Lemma 2.2 that $\ell(s_{j_0} w) = \ell(w) - 1$. Equivalently,

$$\ell(s_{j_0}(s_{i_0} \ltimes s_{i_1} \ltimes s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k})) = \ell(s_{i_0} \ltimes s_{i_1} \ltimes s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k}) - 1.$$

Applying Lemma 2.2 again, we can deduce that

$$\rho(s_{j_0} \ltimes (s_{i_0} \ltimes s_{i_1} \ltimes s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k})) = k.$$

Applying Proposition 2.9, we get that

$$s_{j_0} \ltimes (s_{i_0} \ltimes s_{i_1} \ltimes s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k}) = s_{i_0} \ltimes s_{i_1} \ltimes s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_{a-1}} \ltimes s_{i_{a+1}} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k}$$

for some $0 \le a \le k$. In particular, $s_{i_0} \ltimes s_{i_1} \ltimes s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_{a-1}} \ltimes s_{i_{a+1}} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k} = s_{j_1} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{j_k}$.

Since

$$s_{j_0} \ltimes s_{i_0} \ltimes s_{i_1} \ltimes s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_{a-1}} \ltimes s_{i_{a+1}} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k} = s_{i_0} \ltimes s_{i_1} \ltimes s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k},$$

it is clear that $(j_0, i_0, i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_{a-1}, i_{a+1}, \cdots, i_k)$ is a reduced I_*-expression for w.

It remains to show that

$$(j_0, i_0, i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_{a-1}, i_{a+1}, \cdots, i_k) \longleftrightarrow (i_0, i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_k). \tag{3.19}$$

In fact, once this is proved, we can deduce from induction hypothesis that

$$(i_0, i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_{a-1}, i_{a+1}, \cdots, i_k) \longleftrightarrow (j_1, j_2, \cdots, j_k)$$

because $s_{i_0} \ltimes s_{i_1} \ltimes s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_{a-1}} \ltimes s_{i_{a+1}} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k} = s_{j_1} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{j_k}$, and hence $(j_0, i_0, i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_{a-1}, i_{a+1}, \cdots, i_k) \longleftrightarrow (j_0, j_1, j_2, \cdots, j_k)$. Composing these transformations, we prove (3.18). That is, $(i_0, i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_k) \longleftrightarrow (j_0, j_1, j_2, \cdots, j_k)$.

If $a > 0$, then as $st = ts$,

$$(j_0, i_0, i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_{a-1}, i_{a+1}, \cdots, i_k) \longleftrightarrow (i_0, j_0, i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_{a-1}, i_{a+1}, \cdots, i_k),$$

and hence (3.19) follows from Observation 1.

It remains to consider the case when $a = 0$. In this case, (3.19) becomes

$$(j_0, i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_k) \longleftrightarrow (i_0, i_1, i_2, \cdots, \cdots, i_k), \tag{3.20}$$

We set $w_1 := s_{i_1} \ltimes s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k}$. Then $w_1 \neq 1$. There are two possibilities:

Case 1. $(s, t) \in \{(s_i, s_j), (s_j, s_i) | 1 \le i < j - 1 < n - 1\}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $(s, t) = (s_i, s_j)$, where $i < j - 1 < n - 1$.

If $j - i > 2$, then as $w_1 \neq 1$, it is easy to see that (3.19) follows from Observation 1 and Observation 3.

It remains to consider the case when $j = i + 2$. Furthermore, by Observation 1 and Observation 3, we can only consider the subcase when $w_1 = s_{i+1} \ltimes w_2$ with $\rho(w_1) = \rho(w_2) + 1$. Note that $s_i \ltimes s_{i+1} \neq s_{i+2} \ltimes s_{i+1}$. It follows that $w_2 \neq 1$.

By similar reason, we can further consider only the situation when $i = 1$ and $w_2 = s_u \ltimes w_3$ with $\rho(w_2) = \rho(w_3) + 1$. Note that $s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u \neq s_3 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u$. It follows that $w_3 \neq 1$.

Now $w_3^{-1}(\alpha) = w_3(\alpha) < 0$, where $\alpha \in \Delta$, only if $\alpha \in \{\alpha_i | i \geq 1\}$. Applying Observation 1 and Observation 3, we can assume that $w_3(\alpha_3) < 0$ and hence $w_3 = s_3 \ltimes w_4$ with $\rho(w_3) = \rho(w_4) + 1$. However, in this case,

$$s_3 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u \ltimes s_3 \ltimes w_4 \longleftrightarrow s_3 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes s_u \ltimes w_4 \longleftrightarrow s_2 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u \ltimes w_4.$$

Applying the Observation 3 again, we can deduce that $s_2 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u \ltimes w_4 \longleftrightarrow s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_u \ltimes s_3 \ltimes w_4$. As a result, (3.19) follows at once.

Case 2. $(s, t) \in \{(s_i, s_u), (s_u, s_i) | 1 \leq i < n, i \neq 2\}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $(s, t) = (s_i, s_u)$, where $1 \leq i < n$ and $i \neq 2$.

If $i \geq 3$, then (3.19) can be proved in the same way as in Case 1. It remains to consider the case when $i = 1$. Applying Observation 1, we can assume that $w_1(\alpha_2) < 0$ and hence $w_1 = s_2 \ltimes w_2$ with $\rho(w_1) = \rho(w_2) + 1$. Note that $s_1 \ltimes s_2 \neq s_u \ltimes s_2$. It follows that $w_2 \neq 1$.

Applying Observation 1 and Observation 3 again, we can assume that $w_2(\alpha_3) < 0$ and hence $w_2 = s_3 \ltimes w_3$ with $\rho(w_2) = \rho(w_3) + 1$. Note that $s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_3 \neq s_u \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_3$. It follows that $w_3 \neq 1$. Repeating this argument, we shall finally get that

$$w_1 = s_2 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes s_4 \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{n-1} \ltimes w_{n-1},$$

such that $\rho(w_1) = \rho(w_{n-1}) + n - 2$. By the same argument as before, we can check that $w_{n-1} \neq 1$. Therefore, $\{\alpha \in \Delta | w_{n-1}(\alpha) < 0\} \neq \emptyset$. If $w_{n-1}(\alpha_j) < 0$ for some $2 \leq j < n - 1$, then $w_{n-1} = s_j \ltimes w_n$ with $\rho(w_{n-1}) = \rho(w_n) + 1$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{n-1} \ltimes s_j \ltimes w_n \\
&\quad \longleftrightarrow s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_j \ltimes s_{j+1} \ltimes s_j \ltimes s_{j+2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{n-1} \ltimes w_n \\
&\quad \longleftrightarrow s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{j-1} \ltimes s_{j+1} \ltimes s_j \ltimes s_{j+1} \ltimes s_{j+2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{n-1} \ltimes w_n \\
&\quad \longleftrightarrow s_{j+1} \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{j-1} \ltimes s_j \ltimes s_{j+1} \ltimes s_{j+2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{n-1} \ltimes w_n \\
&\quad \longleftrightarrow s_{j+1} \ltimes s_u \ltimes s_2 \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{j-1} \ltimes s_j \ltimes s_{j+1} \ltimes s_{j+2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{n-1} \ltimes w_n \\
&\quad \longleftrightarrow s_u \ltimes s_2 \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{j-1} \ltimes s_{j+1} \ltimes s_j \ltimes s_{j+1} \ltimes s_{j+2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{n-1} \ltimes w_n \\
&\quad \longleftrightarrow s_u \ltimes s_2 \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{j-1} \ltimes s_j \ltimes s_{j+1} \ltimes s_j \ltimes s_{j+2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{n-1} \ltimes w_n \\
&\quad \longleftrightarrow s_u \ltimes s_2 \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{j-1} \ltimes s_j \ltimes s_{j+1} \ltimes s_{j+2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{n-1} \ltimes s_j \ltimes w_n,
\end{aligned}$$

as required, where the third step follows from Observation 1.

Similarly, if $w_{n-1}(\alpha_1) < 0$ or $w_{n-1}(u) < 0$, then (3.19) will follow from Observation 1 and Observation 3. This completes the proof of the theorem. □

4. Weyl groups of type B_n

In this section we study the braid I_*-transformations between reduced I_*-expressions of involutions in the Weyl group $W(B_n)$ of type B_n. We shall present a complete list of basic braid I_*-transformations in Definition 4.9 and show in Theorem 4.11 that any two reduced I_*-expressions for an involution in $W(B_n)$ can be transformed into each other through a series of basic braid I_*-transformations. As in the last section, we assume that $* = \mathrm{id}$.

Let $W(B_n)$ be the Weyl group of type B_n. It is generated by the simple reflections $\{s_0, s_1, \cdots, s_{n-1}\}$ which satisfy the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&s_i^2 = 1, \quad for\ 0 \le i \le n-1,\\
&s_0 s_1 s_0 s_1 = s_1 s_0 s_1 s_0, \quad s_i s_{i+1} s_i = s_{i+1} s_i s_{i+1}, \quad for\ 1 \le i \le n-2,\\
&s_i s_j = s_j s_i, \quad for\ 0 \le i < j-1 \le n-2.
\end{aligned}$$

Alternatively, $W(B_n)$ can be realized as the subgroup of the permutations on the set $\{1, -1, 2, -2, \cdots, n, -n\}$ (cf. [**1**]) such that:

$$\sigma(i) = j \text{ if and only if } \sigma(-i) = -j \text{ for any } i, j. \tag{4.1}$$

In particular, under this identification, we have that

$$s_0 = (1, -1), \quad s_i = (i, i+1)(-i, -i-1), \ \ for\ 1 \le i < n.$$

Let $\varepsilon_1, \cdots, \varepsilon_n$ be the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$. We set $\alpha_0 := \varepsilon_1$, $\alpha_i := \varepsilon_{i+1} - \varepsilon_i$ for each $1 \le i < n$. For each $1 \le i \le n$, we define $\varepsilon_{-i} := -\varepsilon_i$. Then W acts on the set $\{\varepsilon_i | i = -n, \cdots, -2, -1, 1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ via $\sigma(\varepsilon_i) := \varepsilon_{\sigma(i)}$. Let

$$\Phi := \{\pm\varepsilon_i \pm \varepsilon_j | 1 \le i < j \le n\} \cup \{\pm\varepsilon_i | 1 \le i \le n\}, \ \ E := \mathbb{R}\text{-Span}\{v | v \in \Phi\}.$$

Then Φ is the root system of type B_n in E with $W(B_n)$ being its Weyl group. We choose $\Delta := \{\alpha_i | 0 \le i < n\}$ to be the set of the simple roots. Then $\Phi^+ = \{\varepsilon_j \pm \varepsilon_i, | 1 \le i < j \le n\} \cup \{\varepsilon_i | 1 \le i \le n\}$ is the set of positive roots. For any $0 \ne \alpha \in E$, we write $\alpha > 0$ if $\alpha = \sum_{\beta \in \Delta} k_\beta \beta$ with $k_\beta \ge 0$ for each β.

For any $w \in W(B_n)$ and $\alpha \in \Delta$, it is well-known that

$$w s_\alpha w^{-1} = s_{w(\alpha)}, \tag{4.2}$$

where $s_{w(\alpha)}$ is the reflection with respect to hyperplane which is orthogonal to $w(\alpha)$.

4.3. **Lemma.** *Let $w \in W(B_n)$ and $1 \le i < n$. Then*
1) $ws_i < w$ if and only if $w(\varepsilon_{i+1} - \varepsilon_i) < 0$;
2) $ws_0 < w$ if and only if $w(\varepsilon_1) < 0$.

4.4. **Lemma.** *Let $w \in W(B_n)$ be an involution. In the notations of Lemma 2.12 and the discussion after it, assume that $s = s_\alpha, t = s_\beta$ for some $\alpha \ne \beta \in \Delta$ and $(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(\alpha_0, \alpha_1), (\alpha_1, \alpha_0)\}$ and $m = 4$. Then only Cases 1,2,3,5 happen and the Case 5 happens if and only if either*

a) *$b = 1$; or $b = s_\gamma \ltimes b_1$ with $\gamma \in \Delta$, $b_1 \in I_*$ and $\rho(b) = \rho(b_1) + 1$ and $s_\gamma s_\alpha = s_\alpha s_\gamma$, $s_\gamma s_\beta = s_\beta s_\gamma$; or*
b) *$b = s_2 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_0$; or*
c) *$b = s_2 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_0 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes d$, where $d \in I_*$ and $\rho(b) = \rho(d) + 5$.*

Proof. Since $m = 4$ is even, we see that the Case 4 and the Case 6 do not happen. The Case 7 happens if and only if $s_0 b = b s_1$, $s_1 b = b s_0$. Since $b(\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1) \ne k\varepsilon_1$ where $k \in \mathbb{R}$, so this case would not happen either.

It is clear that the Case 5 happens if and only if $b(\alpha) = \pm\alpha, b(\beta) = \pm\beta$ (by 4.2). By assumption, both (s_β, s_α, b) and (s_α, s_β, b) are reduced I_*-sequences. Applying Corollary 2.3 and Corollary 2.4, we can deduce that $b(\alpha) > 0 < b(\beta)$. It follows that $b(\alpha_0) = \alpha_0, b(\alpha_1) = \alpha_1$. So we have that $b(1) = 1, b(2) = 2$.

Suppose that a) does not happen. It follows from Lemma 4.3 that

$$b(3) < 0, \ b(3) < b(4) < \cdots < b(n).$$

Suppose that $b(3) = -3$. We have that

$$b = s_2 s_1 s_0 s_1 s_2 = s_2 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_0,$$

which is b) as required.

It suffices to consider the case when $b(3) < -3$. In this case,

$$b^{-1}(\alpha_2) = b(\alpha_2) = b(\varepsilon_3 - \varepsilon_2) = b(\varepsilon_3) - \varepsilon_2 < 0,$$

and $b(\alpha_2) \neq \pm\alpha_2$, which could imply that $bs_2 \neq s_2 b$. By Corollary 2.3, we get that $s_2 \ltimes b = s_2 b s_2$ and $\rho(b) = \rho(s_2 \ltimes b) + 1$.

In a similar way, we have that

$$\pm\alpha_1 \neq (s_2 b s_2)(\alpha_1) = (s_2 b s_2)(\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1) = s_2 b(\varepsilon_3) - \varepsilon_1 < 0,$$
$$\pm\alpha_0 \neq (s_1 s_2 b s_2 s_1)(\alpha_0) = (s_1 s_2 b s_2 s_1)(\varepsilon_1) = s_1 s_2 b(\varepsilon_3) < 0,$$
$$\pm\alpha_1 \neq (s_0 s_1 s_2 b s_2 s_1 s_0)(\alpha_1) = \varepsilon_2 + s_0 s_1 s_2 b(\varepsilon_3) < 0,$$
$$\pm\alpha_2 \neq (s_1 s_0 s_1 s_2 b s_2 s_1 s_0 s_1)(\alpha_2) = \varepsilon_3 + s_1 s_0 s_1 s_2 b(\varepsilon_3) < 0.$$

It follows from Corollary 2.3 that

$$s_2 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_0 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes b = s_2 s_1 s_0 s_1 s_2 b s_2 s_1 s_0 s_1 s_2 \text{ and}$$
$$\rho(b) = \rho(s_2 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_0 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes b) + 5.$$

Set $d := s_2 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_0 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes b$. Then $b = s_2 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_0 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes d$ and this is c) as required. So we complete the proof of the lemma. □

4.5. **Lemma.** . *Let $w \in W(B_n)$ be an involution. In the notations of Lemma 2.12 and the discussion after it, assume that $s = s_\alpha, t = s_\beta$ for some $\alpha \neq \beta \in \Delta$ with $(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}), (\alpha_{i+1}, \alpha_i) | 1 \leq i < n-1\}$. Then the Case 4 happens if and only if $m = 3$ and either*

a) *$b = 1$; or $b = s_\gamma \ltimes b_1$ with $\gamma \in \Delta$, $b_1 \in I_*$ and $\rho(b) = \rho(b_1) + 1$ and $s_\gamma s_\alpha = s_\alpha s_\gamma$, $s_\gamma s_\beta = s_\beta s_\gamma$; or*
b) *$(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}), (\alpha_{i+1}, \alpha_i)\}$, $1 \leq i < n-1$, $b = s_{i-1} \ltimes s_i \ltimes s_{i+1} \ltimes d$ or $b = s_{i+2} \ltimes s_{i+1} \ltimes s_i \ltimes d$, where $d \in I_*$ and $\rho(b) = \rho(d) + 3$.*

Proof. One can prove the lemma by the same argument as used in Lemma 3.4 □

4.6. **Lemma.** *Let $w \in W(B_n)$ be an involution. In the notations of Lemma 2.12 and the discussion after it, assume that $s = s_\alpha, t = s_\beta$ for some $\alpha \neq \beta \in \Delta$ with $(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}), (\alpha_{i+1}, \alpha_i) | 1 \leq i < n-1\}$. Then the Case 6 happens if and only if $m = 3$ and either*

a) *$b = s_\gamma \ltimes b_1$ with $\gamma \in \Delta$, $b_1 \in I_*$ and $\rho(b) = \rho(b_1) + 1$ and $s_\gamma s_\alpha = s_\alpha s_\gamma$, $s_\gamma s_\beta = s_\beta s_\gamma$; or*
b) *$(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}), (\alpha_{i+1}, \alpha_i)\}$, $1 \leq i < n-1$, $b = s_{i-1} \ltimes s_i \ltimes s_{i+1} \ltimes d$ or $b = s_{i+2} \ltimes s_{i+1} \ltimes s_i \ltimes d$, where $d \in I_*$ and $\rho(b) = \rho(d) + 3$; or*
c) *$(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(\alpha_1, \alpha_2), (\alpha_2, \alpha_1)\}$, $b = s_0 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_0 \ltimes s_2$, or*

$$b = s_0 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_0 \ltimes s_1.$$

Proof. It is clear that the Case 6 happens if and only if $m = 3$ and $b(\alpha) = \pm\beta$ (by (4.2)). Note that $b(\alpha) = \pm\beta$ if and only if $b(\beta) = \pm\alpha$ because $b^2 = 1$. By assumption, $s_\beta \ltimes s_\alpha \ltimes b$ is a reduced I_*-sequence. Applying Corollary 2.3 and Corollary 2.4, we can deduce that $b(\alpha) > 0$. It follows that $b(\alpha) = \beta$.

Without loss of generality, we can assume that$(\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1})$, where $1 \leq i < n-1$. Suppose that a) does not happen. There are only the following two possibilities:

Case 1. $(\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1})$ for some $2 \leq i < n-1$. Then $b = s_{i-1} \ltimes s_i \ltimes s_{i+1} \ltimes d$ with $\rho(b) = \rho(d) + 3$, which is b) as required. The proof is almost the same as Case 1 in Lemma 3.7 except that $b(1) + b(2) > 0$ is replaced by $b(1) > 0$.

Case 2. $(\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$. Then $b(1) = -3, b(3) = -1, b(2) = -2$. By Lemma 4.3 again, we can get that

$$b(4) < b(5) < \cdots < b(n). \tag{4.7}$$

If $b(4) = \pm 4$, then by (4.7) we can deduce that $b(j) = j$ for any $j \geq 5$. It follows that

$$b = s_0 s_1 s_0 s_2 s_0 s_1 s_0 = s_0 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_0 \ltimes s_2 \text{ or}$$

$$b = s_0 s_3 s_1 s_2 s_3 s_1 s_0 s_1 s_0 s_2 s_1 s_0 s_3 = s_0 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_0 \ltimes s_1,$$

which is c) as required.

It remains to consider the case when $b(4) \leq -5$. In this case, $b = s_3 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes d$ with $\rho(b) = \rho(d) + 3$, which is b) as required. The proof is the same as the counterpart in Case 3 of Lemma 3.7. We complete the proof of the Lemma. □

4.8. *Remark.* We consider reduce I_*-expressions for involutions in the Weyl group of type B_n. In this case, in addition to the basic braid I_*-transformations given by Proposition 2.10, one clearly has to add the following (right ends) transformations:

$$s_i \ltimes s_{i+1} \longleftrightarrow s_{i+1} \ltimes s_i, \;\; s_0 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_0 \longleftrightarrow s_1 \ltimes s_0 \ltimes s_1, \;\; s_k \ltimes s_j \longleftrightarrow s_j \ltimes s_k,$$

where $1 \leq i < n-1$, $0 \leq j, k < n$, $|j-k| > 1$. However, these are *NOT* all the basic braid I_*-transformations for involutions in $W(B_n)$ as what happened in the type D_n case. In fact, one has to add a new basic braid I_*-transformation in the case of type B_n, see the last transformation in Definition 4.9, which is a new phenomenon for type B_n.

4.9. **Definition.** By a basic braid I_*-transformation, we mean one of the following transformations and their inverses:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(s_{i_1}, \cdots, s_{i_a}, s_0, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_{l_1}, \cdots, s_{l_t}, w) \longmapsto \\
&\qquad (s_{i_1}, \cdots, s_{i_a}, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_0, s_{l_1}, \cdots, s_{l_t}, w), \\
&(s_{i_1}, \cdots, s_{i_a}, s_j, s_{j+1}, s_j, s_{l_1}, \cdots, s_{l_t}, w) \longmapsto \\
&\qquad (s_{i_1}, \cdots, s_{i_a}, s_{j+1}, s_j, s_{j+1}, s_{l_1}, \cdots, s_{l_t}, w), \\
&(s_{i_1}, s_{i_2}, \cdots, s_{i_a}, s_b, s_c, s_{l_1}, \cdots, s_{l_t}, w') \longmapsto \\
&\qquad (s_{i_1}, s_{i_2}, \cdots, s_{i_a}, s_c, s_b, s_{l_1}, \cdots, s_{l_t}, w'), \\
&(s_{i_1}, s_{i_2}, \cdots, s_{i_a}, s_k, s_{k+1}) \longmapsto (s_{i_1}, s_{i_2}, \cdots, s_{i_a}, s_{k+1}, s_k), \\
&(s_{i_1}, s_{i_2}, \cdots, s_{i_a}, s_0, s_1, s_0) \longmapsto (s_{i_1}, s_{i_2}, \cdots, s_{i_a}, s_1, s_0, s_1), \\
&(s_{i_1}, s_{i_2}, \cdots, s_{i_a}, s_0, s_1, s_0, s_2, s_1, s_0) \longmapsto \\
&\qquad (s_{i_1}, s_{i_2}, \cdots, s_{i_a}, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_2, s_1, s_0),
\end{aligned}$$

where $1 \neq w, w' \in I_*$, $t \geq 0$, $i_1, \cdots, i_a, l_1, \cdots, l_t \in \{0, 1, 2, \cdots, n-1\}$, $1 \leq j, k < n-1$, $0 \leq b < c-1 < n-1$, and all the sequences appearing above are reduced sequences. We define a braid I_*-transformation to be the composition of a series of basic braid I_*-transformations.

4.10. **Theorem.** *Let $(s_{i_1}, \cdots, s_{i_k}), (s_{j_1}, \cdots, s_{j_k})$ be two reduced I_*-sequences which can be transformed into each other through a series of basic braid transformations. Then*

$$s_{i_1} \ltimes s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k} = s_{j_1} \ltimes s_{j_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{j_k}.$$

Proof. This follows easily from Proposition 2.10 and Definition 4.9. □

Using definition 4.9, we can now define (as in Definition 3.15) the simplified notations $(s_{i_1}, \cdots, s_{i_k}) \longleftrightarrow (s_{j_1}, \cdots, s_{j_k})$ and $(i_1, \cdots, i_k) \longleftrightarrow (j_1, \cdots, j_k)$.

4.11. **Theorem.** *Let $w \in I_*$. Then any two reduced I_*-expressions for w can be transformed into each other through a series of basic braid I_*-transformations.*

Proof. We prove the theorem by induction on $\rho(w)$. Suppose that the theorem holds for any $w \in I_*$ with $\rho(w) \leq k$. Let $w \in I_*$ with $\rho(w) = k+1$. Let $(s_{i_0}, s_{i_1}, s_{i_2}, \cdots, s_{i_k})$ and $(s_{j_0}, s_{j_1}, s_{j_2}, \cdots, s_{j_k})$ be two reduced I_*-expressions for $w \in I_*$. We need to prove that

$$(i_0, i_1, \cdots, i_k) \longleftrightarrow (j_0, j_1, \cdots, j_k). \tag{4.12}$$

For simplicity, we set $s = s_{i_0}, t = s_{j_0}$. Let m be the order of st. We make four useful observations:

Observation 1. If there exists some $s_\alpha \in S$ such that $(i_0, \dots, i_k) \longleftrightarrow (s_\alpha, \dots)$ and $(j_0, \dots, j_k) \longleftrightarrow (s_\alpha, \dots)$, then it is clear (by induction hypothesis and definition) that $(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_k) \longleftrightarrow (s_\alpha, \dots) \longleftrightarrow (j_0, j_1, \dots, j_k)$.

Observation 2. If $m = 3$, then we are in the situations of Cases 1,2,3,4,6 of Lemma 2.12. By Lemma 4.5 and Lemma 4.6, we claim that either (4.12) holds by Definition 4.9, or $(i_0, i_1, \cdots, i_k) \longleftrightarrow (s_\alpha, \dots)$ and $(j_0, j_1, \cdots, j_k) \longleftrightarrow (s_\alpha, \dots)$ for some $s_\alpha \in S$. In these cases, (4.12) follows from induction hypothesis.

In fact, our claim is easy to verify except in the case c) in Lemma 4.6. For this case, when $b = s_0 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_0 \ltimes s_2$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&(s_1, s_2, s_0, s_1, s_0, s_2) \longleftrightarrow (s_1, s_0, s_2, s_1, s_2, s_0) \longleftrightarrow (s_1, s_0, s_1, s_2, s_1, s_0),\\
&(s_2, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_0, s_2) \longleftrightarrow (s_2, s_0, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_2) \longleftrightarrow (s_0, s_2, s_1, s_2, s_0, s_1)\\
&\longleftrightarrow (s_0, s_1, s_2, s_1, s_0, s_1) \longleftrightarrow (s_0, s_1, s_2, s_0, s_1, s_0) \longleftrightarrow (s_0, s_1, s_0, s_2, s_1, s_0)
\end{aligned}$$

as required.

When $b = s_0 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_2 \ltimes s_3 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_0 \ltimes s_1$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
&(s_1, s_2, b) = (s_1, s_2, s_0, s_3, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_1, s_0, s_1)\\
&\longleftrightarrow (s_1, s_2, s_3, s_0, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_1, s_0, s_1) \longleftrightarrow (s_1, s_2, s_3, s_0, s_1, s_2, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_3)\\
&\longleftrightarrow (s_1, s_2, s_3, s_0, s_2, s_1, s_2, s_0, s_1, s_3) \longleftrightarrow (s_1, s_2, s_3, s_2, s_0, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_0, s_1)\\
&\longleftrightarrow (s_1, s_3, s_2, s_3, s_0, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_0, s_1) \longleftrightarrow (s_3, s_1, s_0, s_2, s_1, s_3, s_2, s_3, s_0, s_1)\\
&\longleftrightarrow (s_3, s_1, s_0, s_2, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_2, s_0, s_1) \longleftrightarrow (s_3, s_1, s_2, s_0, s_1, s_0, s_2, s_3, s_2, s_1)\\
&\longleftrightarrow (s_3, s_1, s_2, s_0, s_1, s_0, s_2, s_1, s_2, s_3) \longleftrightarrow (s_3, s_1, s_2, s_0, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_2, s_1, s_3)\\
&\longleftrightarrow (s_3, s_1, s_2, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_0, s_2, s_1, s_3) \longleftrightarrow (s_3, s_2, s_1, s_2, s_0, s_1, s_0, s_2, s_1, s_3)\\
&\longleftrightarrow (s_3, s_2, s_1, s_0, s_2, s_1, s_2, s_0, s_1, s_3) \longleftrightarrow (s_3, s_2, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_2, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_3)\\
&\longleftrightarrow (s_3, s_2, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_1, s_0, s_1) \longleftrightarrow (s_3, s_2, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_0, s_1, s_0)\\
&\longleftrightarrow (s_3, s_2, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_0, s_2, s_3, s_1, s_0) \longleftrightarrow (s_3, s_2, s_0, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_1, s_0)\\
&\longleftrightarrow (s_0, s_3, s_2, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_1, s_0).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, according to the definition of the braid I_*-transformations, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
&(s_2, s_1, b) = (s_2, s_1, s_0, s_3, s_1, s_2, s_3, s_1, s_0, s_1)\\
&\longleftrightarrow (s_2, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_3, s_2, s_3, s_0, s_1, s_0) \longleftrightarrow (s_2, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_0, s_3, s_2, s_3, s_1, s_0)\\
&\longleftrightarrow (s_2, s_0, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_3, s_2, s_3, s_1, s_0) \longleftrightarrow (s_0, s_2, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_3, s_2, s_3, s_1, s_0).
\end{aligned}$$

So again we are in a position to apply the induction hypothesis. This completes the proof of our claim.

Observation 3. If $m = 4$, then we are in the situations of Cases 1,2,3,5 of Lemma 2.12. In the case c) in Lemma 4.4, since

$$\begin{aligned}
s_0s_1s_0s_2s_1s_0s_1s_2 &= s_2s_0s_1s_2s_0s_1s_0s_2\\
s_1s_0s_1s_2s_1s_0s_1s_2 &= s_2s_1s_2s_0s_1s_0s_2s_1,
\end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
(s_0, s_1, s_0, s_2, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_2, d) &\longleftrightarrow (s_2, \dots),\\
(s_1, s_0, s_1, s_2, s_1, s_0, s_1, s_2, d) &\longleftrightarrow (s_2, \dots).
\end{aligned}$$

Henceforth, by Definition 4.9 or Observation 1, (4.12) follows in all above cases.

Observation 4. If there exist $s_\alpha, s_\beta \in S$ such that $s_\alpha s_\beta$ has order 3 or 4 and $(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_k) \longleftrightarrow (s_\alpha, \dots)$, $(j_0, j_1, \dots, j_k) \longleftrightarrow (s_\beta, \dots)$, then it is clear (by Observation 2 or 3) that $(i_0, i_1, \dots, i_k) \longleftrightarrow (j_0, j_1, \dots, j_k)$.

Now we are reduced to the case in which $m = 2$. Then we are in the situations of Cases 1,2,3,5,7 of Lemma 2.12. By Observation 1 or by Definition 4.9, (4.12) is clear except in the case 7. For this case, since $(i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_k) \longleftrightarrow (j_1, j_2, \cdots, i_k)$ by induction hypothesis, (4.12) becomes

$$(j_0, i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_k) \longleftrightarrow (i_0, i_1, i_2, \cdots, \cdots, i_k). \tag{4.13}$$

We set $w_1 := s_{i_1} \ltimes s_{i_2} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{i_k}$. Then $w_1 \neq 1$. $\{s_{i_0}, s_{j_0}\} = \{s_i, s_j\}$, where $\{0 \leq i < j - 1 < n - 1\}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $s_{i_0} = s_i$, $s_{j_0} = s_j$, where $i < j - 1$.

If $j - i > 2$, then as $w_1 \neq 1$, it is easy to see that (4.13) follows from Observation 1 and Observation 4.

It remains to consider the case when $j = i + 2$. By Observation 1 and Observation 4, we can only consider the subcase when $w_1 = s_{i+1} \ltimes w_2$ with $\rho(w_1) = \rho(w_2) + 1$. Note that $s_i \ltimes s_{i+1} \neq s_{i+2} \ltimes s_{i+1}$. It follows that $w_2 \neq 1$. By the similar reason, we can further consider only the situation when $i = 0$ and $w_2 = s_0 \ltimes w_3$ with $\rho(w_2) = \rho(w_3) + 1$. Note that $s_0 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_0 \neq s_2 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_0$. It follows that $w_3 \neq 1$. Applying Observation 1 and Observation 4, we can assume that $w_3 = s_1 \ltimes w_4$ with $\rho(w_3) = \rho(w_4) + 1$. However, in this case,

$$s_0 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_0 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes w_4 \longleftrightarrow s_1 \ltimes s_0 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_0 \ltimes w_4.$$

Applying the Observation 4 again, we can deduce that $s_0 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_0 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes w_4 \longleftrightarrow s_2 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes s_0 \ltimes s_1 \ltimes w_4$. As a result, (4.13) follows at once. This completes the proof of the theorem. □

5. An application

The basic braid I_*-transformations which we found in Definition 3.14, 4.9 and Theorem 3.17, 4.11 are very useful for analysing the Hecke module structures on the space spanned by involutions. The point is that it reduces the verification of Hecke defining relations to a *finite* doable calculations. In this section, we shall give an application of this observation to Lusztig's conjecture which is our original motivation.

5.1. **Lemma.** *The elements in the following set*

$$\Big\{(s_{c_1}s_{c_1-1}\dots s_2s_1)(s_{c_2}s_{c_2-1}\dots s_2s_u)\dots(s_{c_{k-1}}s_{c_{k-1}-1}\dots s_2s_1)(s_{c_k}s_{c_k-1}\dots s_2s_u) \\ \Big| \ k \text{ is even, and } 1 \leq c_1 < c_2 < \cdots < c_k < n\Big\} \bigcup$$

$$\Big\{(s_{c_1}s_{c_1-1}\dots s_2s_u)(s_{c_2}s_{c_2-1}\dots s_2s_1)\dots(s_{c_{k-1}}s_{c_{k-1}-1}\dots s_2s_1)(s_{c_k}s_{c_k-1}\dots s_2s_u) \\ \Big| \ k \text{ is odd, and } 1 \leq c_1 < c_2 < \cdots < c_k < n\Big\}$$

is a complete set of distinguished left coset representatives of $\langle s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{n-1}\rangle$ in $W(D_n)$[1].

Proof. One can check directly that the elements list in the above two sets are distinguished left coset representatives of $\langle s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{n-1}\rangle$ in $W(D_n)$. Moreover, it is a complete set by a counting argument (using the well-known fact that $|W(D_n)| = 2^{n-1}|\mathfrak{S}_n|$). □

5.2. **Lemma.** *Let $W \in \{W(B_n), W(D_n)\}$ and $* = id$. The map $a_1 \mapsto X_\emptyset$ can be extended to a well-defined $\mathbb{Q}(u)$-linear map η_0 from $\mathbb{Q}(u) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} M$ to $(\mathbb{Q}(u) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{H}_u)X_\emptyset$ such that for any $w \in I_*$ and any reduced I_*-expression $\sigma = (s_{j_1}, \cdots, s_{j_k})$ for w,*

$$\eta_0(a_w) = \theta_\sigma(X_\emptyset) := \theta_{\sigma,1} \circ \theta_{\sigma,2} \circ \cdots \circ \theta_{\sigma,k}(X_\emptyset),$$

where for each $1 \leq t \leq k$, if

$$s_{j_t}(s_{j_{t+1}} \ltimes s_{j_{t+2}} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{j_k}) \neq (s_{j_{t+1}} \ltimes s_{j_{t+2}} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{j_k})s_{j_t} > (s_{j_{t+1}} \ltimes s_{j_{t+2}} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{j_k}),$$

[1]By convention, if $c_1 = 1$ then $s_{c_1}s_{c_1-1}\dots s_2s_u := s_u$.

then we define $\theta_{\sigma,t} := T_{s_{j_t}}$*; while if*

$$s_{j_t}(s_{j_{t+1}} \ltimes s_{j_{t+2}} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{j_k}) = (s_{j_{t+1}} \ltimes s_{j_{t+2}} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{j_k})s_{j_t} > (s_{j_{t+1}} \ltimes s_{j_{t+2}} \ltimes \cdots \ltimes s_{j_k}),$$

then we define $\theta_{\sigma,t} := (T_{s_{j_t}} - u)/(u+1)$.

Proof. We only prove the lemma for the case when $W = W(D_n)$ as the other case is similar.

By [**13**], the $\mathcal{H}_u$-module structure on M is defined as follows: for any $s \in S$ and any $w \in I_*$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&T_s a_w = u a_w + (u+1)a_{sw} \quad \text{if } sw = ws > w;\\
&T_s a_w = (u^2-u-1)a_w + (u^2-u)a_{sw} \quad \text{if } sw = ws < w;\\
&T_s a_w = a_{sws} \quad \text{if } sw \neq ws > w;\\
&T_s a_w = (u^2-1)a_w + u^2 a_{sws} \quad \text{if } sw \neq ws < w.
\end{aligned}$$

The idea of the proof is essentially the same as we used in the proof of [**8**, Lemma 5.1] except that we now use Proposition 2.10 and have to verify one more relation:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{T_2-u}{u+1}T_3T_uT_1T_2\frac{T_u-u}{u+1}\frac{T_1-u}{u+1}\frac{T_3-u}{u+1}X_\emptyset =\\
&\qquad \frac{T_3-u}{u+1}T_2T_uT_1T_2\frac{T_u-u}{u+1}\frac{T_1-u}{u+1}\frac{T_3-u}{u+1}X_\emptyset.
\end{aligned}$$

To check this relation, we can assume without loss of generality that $n = 4$ because $\sum_{w\in\mathcal{H}_u(D_4)} u^{-\ell(w)}T_w$ is a left factor of $X_\emptyset$.

To simplify the notation, we set

$$T_u\dots T_u := T_uT_2T_1T_3T_2T_u, \quad T_2\dots T_u := T_2T_1T_3T_2T_u, \quad Y_\emptyset := \sum_{w\in\mathfrak{S}_4} u^{-\ell(w)}T_w.$$

By direct calculation, one can get that

$$\begin{aligned}
&T_uT_1T_2(T_3-u)(T_1-u)(T_u-u)X_\emptyset\\
&= T_uT_1T_2(T_3-u)(T_1-u)(T_u-u)(1+u^{-1}T_u+u^{-2}T_2T_u+u^{-3}T_3T_2T_u\\
&\quad + u^{-3}T_1T_2T_u + u^{-4}T_1T_3T_2T_u + u^{-5}T_2T_1T_3T_2T_u + u^{-6}T_uT_2T_1T_3T_2T_u)Y_\emptyset\\
&= \Big(uT_1T_2T_uT_2 - T_1T_2T_uT_2T_1 - T_1T_2T_uT_2T_3 + u^{-1}T_1T_2T_uT_2T_1T_3 + u^{-2}T_2\dots T_uT_3T_2\\
&\quad - u^{-3}T_2\dots T_uT_3T_2T_1 + u^{-4}T_2\dots T_uT_3T_2T_1T_3 - u^{-3}T_2\dots T_uT_3T_2T_3 +\\
&\quad 2(u^{-2}-u^{-4})T_u\dots T_uT_3T_2 - (u^{-3}-u^{-5})T_u\dots T_uT_3T_2T_1 - (u^{-1}-u^{-3})T_u\dots T_uT_3\\
&\quad + (u^{-4}-u^{-6})T_u\dots T_uT_3T_2T_1T_3 - (u^{-3}-u^{-5})T_u\dots T_uT_3T_2T_3\Big)Y_\emptyset.
\end{aligned}$$

Let Z_0 be the element in the big bracket of the last equality. We want to show that $(T_2T_3-T_3T_2+uT_2-uT_3)Z_0Y_\emptyset = 0$. Using Lemma 5.1, we see that if we express $(T_2T_3-T_3T_2+uT_2-uT_3)Z_0$ as a linear combination of standard bases $\{T_w|w\in W(D_n)\}$, then T_w occurs with non-zero coefficient only if

$$w \in s_u\dots s_u\mathfrak{S}_4 \bigcup s_2\dots s_u\mathfrak{S}_4 \bigcup s_3s_1s_2s_u\mathfrak{S}_4 \bigcup s_1s_2s_u\mathfrak{S}_4.$$

By the proof of [**8**, Lemma 5.1], we know that for any $1 \le j < 3$,

$$T_j(T_{j+1}-u)Y_\emptyset = T_{j+1}(T_j-u)Y_\emptyset. \tag{5.3}$$

Using (5.3) and consider the above four left cosets separately, one can check that $(T_2T_3 - T_3T_2 + uT_2 - uT_3)Z_0Y_\emptyset = 0$. For example, if we consider the term T_w which occurs in

$(T_2T_3 - T_3T_2 + uT_2 - uT_3)Z_0Y_\emptyset$ such that $w \in s_1s_2s_u\mathfrak{S}_4$, then we shall get that it is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big(u^2T_1T_2T_uT_1T_2 - uT_1T_2T_uT_1T_2T_1 - uT_1T_2T_uT_1T_2T_3 + T_1T_2T_uT_1T_2T_1T_3\\
&\quad - u^2T_1T_2T_uT_3T_2 + uT_1T_2T_uT_3T_2T_3 + uT_1T_2T_uT_3T_2T_1 - T_1T_2T_uT_3T_2T_1T_3\big)Y_\emptyset\\
&= T_1T_2T_u\big(u^2T_1T_2 - uT_1T_2T_1 - uT_1T_2T_3 - u^2T_3T_2 + uT_3T_2T_3 + uT_3T_2T_1\\
&\quad + T_2T_1T_2T_3 - T_2T_3T_2T_1\big)Y_\emptyset\\
&= T_1T_2T_u\Big(u^2T_1T_2 - uT_1T_2T_1 - uT_1(T_3T_2 - uT_3 + uT_2) - u^2T_3T_2 + uT_3T_2T_3 +\\
&\quad uT_3(T_1T_2 - uT_1 + uT_2) + T_2T_1(T_3T_2 - uT_3 + uT_2) - T_2T_3(T_1T_2 - uT_1 + uT_2)\Big)Y_\emptyset\\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

as required, where we have used (5.3) in the second equality. For the other three cosets, one can do some similar calculation. We leave the details to the readers. □

5.4. **Corollary.** *With the notations as in Lemma 5.2, the $\mathbb{Q}(u)$-linear map η_0 is a left $(\mathbb{Q}(u)\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}_u)$-module homomorphism. In particular, $\eta_0 = \eta$ is a well-defined surjective left $(\mathbb{Q}(u)\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}_u)$-module homomorphism from $\mathbb{Q}(u)\otimes_{\mathcal{A}} M$ onto $(\mathbb{Q}(u)\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}_u)X_\emptyset$.*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 5.2 and a similar argument used in the proof [**8**, Lemma 5.3, Theorem 5.5]. □

5.5. *Remark.* 1) Lusztig proved in [**12**] that his conjecture holds for any Coxeter group and any $*$ by completely different approach. In other words, η is always a left $(\mathbb{Q}(u)\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}_u)$-module isomorphism from $\mathbb{Q}(u)\otimes_{\mathcal{A}} M$ onto $(\mathbb{Q}(u)\otimes_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{H}_u)X_\emptyset$.

2) We conjecture that for any Coxeter system (W, S) with S finite and any automorphism "$*$" as described in Section 1, there exists a *finite* many types of basic braid I_*-transformations on the set of reduced I_*-expressions for (twisted) involutions in W such that any two reduced I_*-expressions of a fixed (twisted) involutions can be transformed into each other through a series of basic braid transformations.

We end this paper with the following result.

5.6. **Lemma.** *Let W be an arbitrary finite Weyl group. Let $\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{H}(W)$ be the one parameter Iwahori–Hecke algebra associated to W with Hecke parameter u^2 and defined over $\mathbb{C}(u)$. Let $\mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{H})$ be the complete set of non-isomorphic simple $\mathcal{H}(W)$-modules. Then*

$$\sum_{V\in\mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{H})} \dim V = \#\{w \in W | w^2 = 1\}.$$

Proof. By a result of Geck [**3**], $\mathcal{H}(W)$ is cellular with the involution given by the anti-isomorphism "$\star$". Let $\{m_{ij}\}$ be he cellular basis of $\mathcal{H}(W)$. Then $m_{ij}^\star = m_{ji}$ for each i, j.

We calculate the trace of anti-isomorphism "$\star$" on $\mathcal{H}(W)$ in two ways: one is with respect to the standard basis $\{T_w\}_{w\in W}$, where we get that

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\star) = \#\{w \in W | w^2 = 1\};$$

Another way is to do it with respect to the cellular basis $\{m_{ij}\}$, where we get that

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\star) = \sum_{V\in\mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{H})} \dim V.$$

This proves that $\sum_{V\in\mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{H})} \dim V = \#\{w \in W | w^2 = 1\}$. □

REFERENCES

[1] A. BJÖRNER, F. BRENTI, *Combinatorics of Coxeter groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **231**, Springer, 2005.

[2] B. DENG, J. DU, B. PARSHALL AND J. WANG, *Finite dimensional algebras and quantum groups*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, **150**, American Mathematical Society, 2008.

[3] M. GECK, *Hecke algberas of finite type are cellular*, Invent. Math., **169** (2007), 501–517.

[4] J. HU, *Quasi-parabolic subgroups of the Weyl group of type D*, European Journal of Combinatorics, **28** (2007), 807–821.

[5] A. HULTMAN, *Fixed points of involutive automorphisms of the Bruhat order*, Adv. Math., **195**(1) (2005), 283-C296.

[6] ———, *The Combinatorics of twisted involutions in Coxeter groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **359**(6) (2007), 2787–2798.

[7] J.E. HUMPHREYS, *Reflection Groups and Coxeter Groups*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Vol. **29**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK, 1990.

[8] J. HU, J. ZHANG, *On involutions in symmetric groups and a conjecture of Lusztig*, Adv. Math., **364** (2016), 1189-1254.

[9] R.E. KOTTWITZ, *Involutions in Weyl groups*, Representation Theory, **4** (2000), 1–15.

[10] G. LUSZTIG, *A bar operator for involutions in a Coxeter groups*, (2012), preprint, arXiv:1112.0969.

[11] ———, *Asymptotic Hecke algebras and involutions*, (2012), preprint, arXiv:1204.0276.

[12] ———, *An involution based left ideal in the Hecke algebra*, Representation Theory, **20**, (8), (2016), 172–186.

[13] G. LUSZTIG, D. VOGAN, *Hecke algebras and involutions in Weyl groups*, Bulletin of the Institute of Mathematics Academia Sinica (New Series), **7**(3) (2012), 323–354.

[14] H. MATSUMOTO, *Générateurs et relations des groupes de Weyl généralisés*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, **258**, (1964), 3419–3422.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, BEIJING INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, BEIJING, 100081, P.R. CHINA

E-mail address: ellenbox@bit.edu.cn

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ZHEJIANG UNIVERSITY, HANGZHOU, 310027, P.R. CHINA

E-mail address: junhu303@qq.com